



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



C6488.38

Bound
JUN 8 1901



Harvard College Library

FROM

The Library of
The Episcopal Theol. School

28 Nov. 1900.

PATIENCE AND CONFIDENCE

THE

STRENGTH OF THE CHURCH.

A SERMON

PREACHED

ON THE FIFTH OF NOVEMBER,

BEFORE

THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

AT S. MARY'S,

And published at the wish of many of its Members.

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH,
AND LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE.

In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength. *Isaiah xxx. 15.*

SECOND EDITION.

OXFORD,

J. H. PARKER ; J. G. AND F. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

1838.

C 6486.38
~~111, 9782~~



Library of the
Episcopal Theol School

TO THE
REV. JOHN KEBLE, M.A.
PROFESSOR OF POETRY, AND LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL,
WHO IN YEARS PAST
UNCONSCIOUSLY IMPLANTED A TRUTH
WHICH WAS AFTERWARDS TO TAKE ROOT,
HIMSELF THE DUTIFUL DISCIPLE
OF ITS ANTIENT GUARDIAN AND FAITHFUL WITNESS
IN WORD AND ACTION
THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,
THIS SERMON
IS INSCRIBED WITH EVERY FEELING
OF RESPECTFUL AND AFFECTIONATE GRATITUDE
FOR THIS AND MANY OTHER BENEFITS.



PREFACE.

NON-RESISTANCE and passive obedience, in the sense to which they are generally limited, are but two sides of the same doctrine, (the former speaking of it negatively, as not opposing force to force, the latter positively, as taking patiently whatever may be laid upon one,) and, together, are only a particular application of a general principle. In religion, it is faith; under misfortune, it is resignation; under trial, it is patient waiting for the end; amid provocation, it is gentleness; amid affronts, meekness; amid injuries, it is endurance; towards enemies, non-requital; towards railing, it is "not answering again;" to parents, it is filial obedience; to superiors, respect; to authorities, unquestioning submission; towards Civil Government, it is obedience upon principle, not only when it costs nothing, (as obedience to *it* ordinarily does not, and so can hardly be called the fulfilment of a duty,) but when it costs something.

On this, (as on almost every other subject of morals) our standard in this superficial age is for the most part lax and low; not simply (as of course it ever must be) in the selfish and profane, but in the current notions of the day. Maxims are received as indisputable, which betray a mixture of Heathenism with Christianity, and which proceed upon no principle even of heathen morality. As a warning against this, it has been wished, in the fol-

lowing Sermon, to point out how deeply the principle itself lies in Holy Scripture, how largely it extends, how it was acted upon by the Church, in her healthy state, and how God has uniformly blessed those who acted upon it, and has chastised those who abandoned it. But though the circumstances of the day required it to be illustrated by the events, for which that day is so memorable, and that the lesson of those events should be inculcated, it was not intended to consider the doctrine prominently in its political bearings, much less to confine it to what politicians of these days would consider as such. For the temptations to offend against this law, in the extreme degree of rebellion, are happily very rare, while yet the principle itself may be broken very frequently. Over-eagerness to have what is really wrong redressed, when we are the sufferers; taking matters into men's own hands; *combinations* to use a moral compulsion upon Governors to abrogate what is really oppressive;—in short, a scheming, contriving activity of any sort, is, in itself, opposed to this principle, and likely to tend, more or less, to its overt breach. It is in the strong conviction that the enemies of the Church have no power to hurt her, any more than the lions whose mouths God had shut, while Daniel was in their den, to hurt His Prophet, but that those over-anxious for her, or who would help her by human contrivances, may injure her very seriously, that the warnings held out by God's dealings in such cases have been insisted on.

With regard to the special instance of the English revolution of 1688, the question is now happily one of practical importance, only, as relates to men's feelings and principles, not to any political mode of acting. We are now enabled by the distance of time, and God's intervening mercies, to look at that action in its real character, without dread of involving ourselves in practical consequences

which we would gladly avoid. Now, it were absurd or hypocrisy to suppose that the title of the present family to the Crown is in the least affected by the character of the Act of 1688. It were to confuse the abstract question of the original right of succession with the Christian duty of submission and allegiance. Our Lord bade the Pharisees pay tribute to the Cæsar, and not to prevaricate about the origin of their right. Further, the extinction of the unhappy line which were then in possession of the throne;—the circumstance, that the family now placed upon it, were not the immediate successors of that family, but came in in a more orderly way;—their long undisputed possession of it;—happily can leave no doubt in any mind that they are to be *acknowledged*, as well as obeyed, as “the powers that be.” If, in ordinary cases, possession for a long period constitutes right, much more, where God’s law requires men to submit quietly to “the powers that be,” without defining how they came to be such. It was not in a legitimate way that the Emperors, whom S. Paul and S. Peter commanded men to obey, came to the throne, nor had they even prescription to plead; yet, as far as the subjects were concerned, “the powers that be were ordained of God.” No one again can doubt that our early wars with France were wrong, on the ground that they were ambitious, covetous wars, independently of the question as to our title to the crown disputed; they were aggressions against “the powers that be:” our Sovereigns have admitted the principle by relinquishing the title; nor could any one doubt that the French were right in obeying their then king, and opposing ours. The contrary would be looked on as absurd. As absurd would it be, to think that the king of Sardinia has any Christian title to be Sovereign of this kingdom, though in the natural order of things, the crown would have descended upon him. It is idle, too, to argue, that but for the revolution of

1688, the present family would never have been placed upon the throne. Who knows it, or has any right to affirm it? All we know, is, that it would not have been there placed, *in the way in which it was*. But who can say that it might not have been raised upon it in some other way, as, indeed, that act had no apparent connection with it? The principle, which the elevation of the present family involves, is not the right of subjects to depose their Sovereign, but the right of the existing authority to pass over the individual next in succession, as disqualified, as a parent may disinherit his son. This principle often exercised would indeed make a monarchy almost elective, but it is a civil question, and has no connection with the duties of subjects. This sort of arguing about what *might* have been the consequence of a different line of action 150 years ago, is worse than idle; it is Atheistic; for it implies that every thing else must have taken the same course which it since has, i. e. that fate, not God's Providence, governs the world. As for those who, having been for a long period employed in sowing disloyalty, have now discovered that the doctrine of Non-resistance is disloyal, while one rejoices that they can in any way propagate loyalty, (though it be "out of envy and strife,") it were enough to answer with the Christians against whom the like charge was made: "We are defamed as disloyal to the Emperor;—yet they, who had sworn 'by the genii of the Cæsars,' who had offered victims and vows for their welfare, who had often condemned the Christians, have been found their enemies. The Christian is the enemy of no one, much less of the Emperor." (Tertull. ad Scap. init.) On the principles of Non-resistance, whence is resistance or disturbance to arise? It is, truly, the story of "the wolf and the lamb."

But to those of more earnest mind, who recognize the Providence of God, and believe that the tracks of past

events are not blotted out by mere length of time, but that as the Heathen Oracle said,

*Ὁρκου παῖς ἐστὶν ἀνάνυμος, οὐδ' ἔπι χεῖρες,
 Οὐδὲ πόδες· κραιπνὸς δὲ μετέρχεται, εἰσόκε πᾶσαν
 Συμμάρψας ὀλέσει γενεὴν, καὶ οἶκον ἅπαντα.
 Ἄνδρὸς δ' εὐόρκου γενεὴ μετόπισθεν ἀμείνων.*

it is, as is here urged, of practical moment, to reconsider our own views of the deeds of our fathers, to see, if the oath of allegiance were broken, that we bring not its terrible progeny upon our race and name, by persisting in “allowing the deeds of our fathers;” not as wishing to undo evil by evil towards man, but to efface it by repentance towards God: so shall that which naturally could not be effaced, but must work on its own fearful consequences, be effaced by His loving-kindness whose it is to “blot out transgressions.” What has been done nationally amiss must be by the nation repented of; and if this is not in our power, at least we may repent of what any of us have done individually by “calling evil, good,” and increase our peaceable submission and obedience to that Sovereign whom God has now placed over us, not as the instrument of man’s will, but as “ordained of God.” The question, then, is to be looked upon not as a theory, but as an earnest practical principle, involving practical consequences in submission to God and man.

And if any be prejudiced against the doctrine, because it is opposed to the current notions of the day, let him consider how much besides of valuable truth will, in a superficial age, share the same fate. It is discarded, not because it has been disproved, but because it is “out of date,” just as if eternal truth were a matter of Chronology; or as if any changes introduced by men could annul the ordinance of God. Dean Sherlock said, shortly

before 1688, "the principles of rebellion are openly professed and taught, and the doctrine of Non-resistance and Passive Obedience *"not confuted, but laughed out of countenance."* (Dedication to "Case of resistance to the supreme powers stated and resolved according to the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures," 1684.) But they who think a duty laid down in Holy Scripture worthy their serious thought, will do well (apart from the bias of vulgar opinion, or the fear of possible consequences) to review in their own consciences, how notions which they have adopted, perhaps, because they are generally received, can consist with the plain meaning of the Word of God.

This may be facilitated by the study of Dean Sherlock's book; who, for "the doctrine and practice of the Primitive Christians," refers to "that admirable discourse of Archbishop Ussher, about the power of the Prince and the obedience of the subject, which will not cost much money, nor take up much time to read." (Ib. pp. 2, 3.) Philosophers and politicians of the present day may be surprised to find, that Bp. Berkeley maintains the same doctrine, "on the principles of reason common to all mankind^a."

^a Abp. Ussher's work is entitled "The power communicated by God to the Prince, and the obedience required of the subject, briefly laid down, and confirmed out of the holy Scriptures, the testimony of the primitive Church, the dictates of right reason, and the opinion of the wisest among heathen writers." It was written at the command of King Charles I, lost, for the time, "through the negligence or unfaithfulness" of the publisher, and finally published with a preface by Bp. Sanderson, in the reign of King Charles II. Bp. Berkeley's work is the substance of three sermons, preached at the College Chapel; his position is, "that there is an absolute unlimited non-resistance or passive obedience due to the supreme civil power wherever placed in any nation.

The statements above made are altogether the same as those formally received by the Church in the Convocation of 1603—1610, in which they were “passed with one consent.” (See Bp. Overall’s Convocation-Book, p. 92.) The 28th Canon runs thus :

“ If any man therefore shall affirm, either *that the subjects, when they shake off the yoke of their obedience to their Sovereigns*, and set up a form of government among themselves, after their own humours, do not therein very wickedly; or that it is lawful for any bordering kings, through ambition and malice, to invade their neighbours; or that *the Providence and goodness of God, in using of rebellions and oppressions to execute His justice against any king or country*, doth mitigate or qualify the offences of any such rebels or oppressing kings; or *that, when any such new forms of government, begun by rebellion, are after thoroughly settled, the authority in them is not of God*; or that any who live within the territories of such new governments, are not bound to be subject to God’s authority, which is there executed, but may rebel against the same; or that the Jews, either in Egypt or Babylon, might lawfully, for any cause, have taken arms against any of those kings, or have offered any violence to their persons; he doth greatly erre.”

The Convocation-Book itself is valuable also, as clearly and definitely tracing out the origin of Government from the Patriarchal form, instead of assuming any original social compact with the people. For the notion of the

social compact presupposes that the source of power came from below, whereas it is plain in Holy Scripture that it was derived from above. Scripture knows but of two sources of power; 1. lawful, whereby the parental authority of the head of the family was gradually extended with the extension of the family, and so became patriarchal, which was in a sense regal; 2. unlawful, that of conquest, as Nimrod. But of any state of things wherein the people had power in their own hands, to give it to whom they would, and upon what conditions they would, it knows not. "If," says Bp. Sanderson, "we will but follow the clue of the Sacred History in the four first chapters of Genesis, it will fairly lead us out of these labyrinths," [viz. whether Government or Property were first in order of time, and whether Government were agreed upon to secure Property, or Property was assigned by Law and Government; in a word, whether Government came from above or below, was voluntarily adopted, or was the original constitution of things, and part of the primary ordinance of God.] "It is certain, that as soon as Adam was created, God gave to him as an universal monarch, not only dominion over all his fellow-creatures that were upon the face of the earth, but the government also of all the inferior world, and of all the men that after should be born into the world so long as he lived; so as whatsoever property any other persons afterwards had or could have in any thing in any part of the world, (as Cain and Abel, 'tis well known, had their properties in several, and distinct either from other,) they held it all of him, and had it originally by his gift or assignment either immediately or mediately. Whence we may also conclude, both *in hypothesi*, that Adam's government was before Cain's property; and *in thesi*, that undoubtedly government was before property. And we have great reason to believe that after the flood

the sole government was at first in Noah, and whatsoever either property in any thing they possessed in several, or share in the government over any part of the world afterward any of his sons had, they had it by his sole allotment and authority, and transmitted the same to their posterity merely upon that account; without awaiting the election or consent of, or entering into any articles or capitulations with, the people that were to be governed by them. Those words in Gen. x. 32. seem to import as much, "These are the families of the sons of Noah in their generations after their nations: and by them were the nations divided in the earth after the flood." And so this supposed pact or contract, which maketh such a noise in the world, proveth to be but a squib, powder without shot, that giveth a crack, but vanisheth into air, and doth no execution." Preface, §. 18.

In like manner, the Church in Convocation, laid as the basis of their statement the same historical view.

Cap. 2.

"To him that shall duly read the Scripture, it will be plain and evident, that the Son of God having created our first parents, and proposing to multiply their seed into many generations, for the replenishing of the world with their posterity, did give to Adam for his time, and to the rest of the patriarchs, and chief fathers successively before the flood, authority, power, and dominion over their children, and offspring, to rule and govern them; ordaining by the very law of nature, that their said children and offspring (begotten and brought up by them) should fear, reverence, honour, and obey them. Which power and authority before the flood, resting in the patriarchs, and in the chief fathers, because it had a very large extent, not only for the education of their said children and offspring, whilst they were young; but likewise for the

ordering, ruling, and governing of them afterwards, when they came to man's estate; and for that also it had no superior authority, or power over, or above it on earth, appearing in the Scriptures, although it be called either patriarchal, regal, or imperial, and that we only term it potestas patria: yet, being well considered, how far it did reach, we may truly say, that it was in a sort potestas regia; as now in a right and true construction, potestas regia may justly be called potestas patria." And to this it subjoined the following Canon.

"If any man shall therefore affirm, that men at the first, without all good education, or civility, ran up and down in woods and fields as wild creatures, resting themselves in caves, and dens, and acknowledging no superiority one over another, until they were taught by experience the necessity of government; and that thereupon they chose some among themselves to order and rule the rest, giving them power and authority so to do; and that consequently all civil power, jurisdiction, and authority, was first derived from the people and disordered multitude; or either is originally still in them, or else is deduced by their consent naturally from them; and is not God's ordinance originally descending from Him, and depending upon Him; he doth greatly erre." (Can. 2.)

All the theories of the origin of Government, however they may vary in the details of their application, or even though they urge results opposed to what might naturally or legitimately be inferred from their principles, may be referred to these two; that which supposes a state of nature, (as it is called,) in which men, no ways connected with each other, did for mutual security establish a civil government, abridging their own natural rights, and setting kings over them on certain conditions,—the system of a "social

compact;" the other, that which supposes men always to have existed in society, as being derived from a common origin, and the authority of the governor to have been derived from that, originally given to the head of the family by God, (as Abel was naturally to have been subject to Cain, Gen. iv. 7.) the "Patriarchal system." And so (as Bp. Sanderson above observed) all turns on this, whether "property be supposed antecedent to government," i. e. whether men be supposed in a state of having something of their own, (whether actual property, or with Hobbes "a right of every man to every thing,") and thence to have formed governments for themselves, and so the original of government be with the people, or whether "government be antecedent to property," i. e. established by God in the first instance, and derived from Him. The former of these (and so the so-called "social compact") is obviously an unbelieving theory, (even if any who adopted it should not have been unbelievers; Hooker, although he employs some of its language as having been derived from the Roman law, manifestly does not adopt the theory itself,) and is that of Hobbes, Locke, Hume, Gibbon, Montesquieu, and other politicians; the other is that of the Church; and it is remarkable, that the latter, the religious view, though connected with the high doctrine of Non-resistance, found no acceptance with King James I, who wished to assist the insurgent Netherlands; the other, although virtually subverting authority, was a favourite with the court of King Charles II, so that "an original power by nature in the people was the only theme then in fashion:" (Sir R. Filmer, *Obs. on Forms of Government*, p. 18.) so little do states or statesmen often know of the principles whence their strength is derived! The unbelieving character of the received theory, and wherein this unbelieving character

consisted, is again pointed out by Bp. Sanderson. "True it is, that a mere rationalist, (i. e. in plain English, *an Atheist of the late edition,*) who giveth more faith to such heathen philosophy as affirmeth the world to have been ab æterno, than to divine revelation, which assureth us it had a beginning, (and some of the great champions of the opinion we now speak of, have given cause enough of suspicion that they are little better,) such a one, I say, cannot possibly get out of the circle," [since on any natural principles, property presupposed government, and government property], "but to us who believe the Scriptures and acknowledge a creation, the solution of both is easy."

In like manner Bp. Horsley :

"Mankind from the beginning never existed otherwise than in society and under government. Whence follows this important consequence, that to build the authority of princes, or of the chief magistrate under whatever denomination, upon any compact or agreement between the individuals of a multitude living previously in a state of nature, is in truth to build a reality upon a fiction." Sermon. xlv. preached before the House of Lords, on the anniversary of the Martyrdom of King Charles I.

Some sentences are inserted in the Sermon now, which could not be introduced into the delivery, for fear of interfering with a service, which was to follow.

EXOD. xiv. 13.

*Fear ye not, stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord,
which He will shew to you to-day.*

THE history of the Old Testament is the Sun of all other history, Christian or profane. In it, the cloud which veils the mercy-seat, as well as the pathways of Divine Providence, is withdrawn, and the light from behind the cloud flashes through, the token of the Divine presence to those who can behold it, light to His people, although to the Egyptians darkness. So marked, indeed, is the analogy of the kingdoms of unseen and revealed Providence, that men must acknowledge it one way or the other; unless they trace it where it is less distinct, they will lose sight of it where it is most clear; unless they explain what is less known by what is declared, they will explain away what is declared by what is obscure; unless they make use of the light given them where they might see, it will be withdrawn from them where they think they see. Twilight, in that it has a portion of light, has a correspondence with day-break; and whoso, when the light is come, will not explain the indistinct outlines which he saw, "men as trees, walking," by the distincter and revealed forms he now beholds, must go on to walk in the darkness which he loves rather than light. They who interpret not what

men call nature by the Bible, will bring down the Bible to the standard of nature.

This has been done of old times. This very history of the passage of the Red sea, Josephus, it has been wisely noticed, "in his worst spirit of compromise," compared to an escape of Alexander; and the modern historian of the Jews, who, with a righteous indignation, censured Josephus, was himself much to be blamed for the like parallels; and what was in his case rightly condemned, was, in another form, circulated as religious teaching^a. Whoso, again, will not recognize the finger of God in His providential cures, will not see it in His miraculous; they who resolve every thing into secondary or physical causes in the one case, and will not see Him who is the Cause of all causes, and worketh by all those things, whose operation meets our senses, will lose all sense for discerning His hand, where Scripture plainly declares it. When men had explained away, as the *mere* effects of imagination, cures, in modern times, out of the wonted

^a These cases are adduced, not to censure the individuals;—the error was not theirs only, it is that of their age;—but to illustrate the exceeding liability to such error, whenever the attempt is made to interest people in the Bible, on the current principles of ordinary life, to make the characters of the Bible interesting any how to persons of any stamp. The Society alluded to corrected its work, yet it is instructive, that a Society in high repute should have fallen into the error, which had recently been so strongly condemned. It too was attempting to keep pace with the times, and to conciliate half-believers.

order of God's Providence, which, though no confirmation of a religious system, seem to have been personal rewards to strong personal faith, they were ready to apply the same principle to many of the miracles of the Gospel; when they had altogether ceased to see in any derangement of the faculties, a power permitted to evil spirits, they were prepared and did, as soon as it was suggested, deny it in the dæmoniacs of the New Testament^b. And so, again, one may see the evil of a class

^b A controversy on this subject, which led to the disbelief of the actual "possessions" in the New Testament, was confessedly the commencement of German rationalism. It is not meant, by the above, to assert positively that *all* insanity is the effort of dæmoniacal agency; (Scripture distinguishes sometimes *σεληνιαζόμενοι* from *δαίμονιζόμενοι*;) but only to protest against the arbitrary limitation of that agency to the Gospel period. Church history directly proves its continuance beyond that period; thoughtful and reverent observation will leave no doubt, that much termed insanity (as in the case of many suicides, but also in others) is in fact Satanic re-possession of the house which had been "swept and garnished." Our popular and poetic language, in its use of the word "possest," "what possesses him?" bears testimony to the former belief, and even, in our present use, shews that we acknowledge a phænomenon higher than we can explain. We speak thus of persons (to say the least) as not being under their own control, being driven about by some agency within them, impelled to acts, which, if they were their own masters, they would not do. Other languages express this even more plainly; and it is expressed more or less forcibly in all modern languages, e. g. *Fr.* possédé; *Ital.* ossesso, invasato; *Span. Port.* possesso; *Germ.* besitzen, besitzung, besessener; and so in others. Popular language is more philosophical and truer than scientific.

of illustration, derived from the Arminian school, whereby all sorts of heathen sayings are brought into parallel with Gospel teaching ; so soon as they ceased to be regarded as the seeds of truth which the Divine Word had scattered among the Heathen, (as way-marks and finger-posts, looking on to something to come, and requiring correction and developement,) and were viewed as something independent and substantial, they were used as interpreters, or critics, or rivals, of Gospel truth. The words of inspiration again are glowing language, such as in human compositions is poetry ; but whoso looked upon the Hebrew prophets as poets, forgot that they were the awful messengers of the Most High ; as they who measured by earthly principles the actions of God's instruments, lost sight Whose they were, and Whom they served ; he who illustrated the law given by Moses, upon the principles of ordinary legislation^c, undermined in his Church and people the belief that it was divine. Apologists, accordingly, in every department, have substituted a human counterfeit for the divine reality, by illustrations, by defending, (as they deemed,) divine truths on human principles, by explaining " hard sayings" through the commonplaces of ordi-

^c J. D. Michaelis on the Laws of Moses ; a book which uniformly exhibits things on the lowest and most commonplace side, setting out on the assumption, that Moses was an ordinary legislator.

nary morality, the justice of God by the expediency of men: and on this ground, there has (as a fact) been no more fruitful source of heresy or unbelief, than defences of the faith.

In history, morals, poetry, legislation, philosophy, language, physics, religion,—Heaven and Earth, a body of clay and a spirit breathed into its nostrils by the life-giving Spirit, stand over against each other, and whoso lifteth not up the earthly to the heavenly, will bring down the heavenly to the earthly. “Homer,” says even a heathen^d, “transferred human things to the gods; would he had rather things divine to man!” If the body be not spiritualized, the soul will be carnalized.

The light then of all history is God’s guidance, dim indeed often, and overlaid by the intricacy of human policy and craftiness, yet still visible to those who in the detail of the workmanship forget not the Maker, nor allow themselves by the study of the visible creature to be held down from beholding the Invisible. Even in Heathen empires He declares by His prophets, that “*He* changeth the times and seasons: *He* removeth kings, and setteth up kings^e.” Even there among those who seem to rule, He is the One Ruler. “The Most High ruleth *in* the kingdom of men,” (an unseen power *within* man’s visible kingdom, per-

^d Cicero, Tusc. i. c. 26. Fingebat hæc Homerus, et humana ad Deos transferebat; divina mallet ad nos.

^e Dan. ii. 21.

mitting or withholding, uniting or dissolving, giving strength or bringing age upon them, and directing man's free-agency, like the wild uproar of the sea, to His own ends, unseen by man His work, but ever present with and *within* His work,) "the Most High ruleth *in* the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will^f." Pharaoh, Cyrus, the "Assyrian, the rod of His anger^g," but "who meant not so, neither did his heart think so^h," Nebuchadnezzar, of whom God saith by Jeremiah, "I who made the earth, the man and beast upon the ground,—and have given it unto whom it seemed good unto me, and now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, my servant,—and all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son, until the very time of *his* land come, and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of himⁱ,"—these are but so many specimens and instances of His universal empire, doing all that is good, and ordering what is evil, so "that the wrath of man doth but praise Him^k."

And this should be understood not simply of certain fixed laws, whereby the rise and decay of states are regulated, as that an enduring self-denying state should prosper, a luxurious self-indulgent people should decay, an upright state should acquire might, a crafty (like Carthage) should be taken in its own craftiness, and the like,—as if God were

^f Dan. iv. 25. ^g Isaiah x. 5. ^h Ver. 7. ⁱ Jer. xxvii. 5—7.
^k Ps. lxxvi. 10.

separate from His Providence and His laws, and His law were an abstraction to which He had committed the government of things, and not rather that His laws were His own continued action, dispensing in one *uniform* way His sovereign will, because “in Him is no variableness, neither shadow of turning,” but still Himself, personally present and personally measuring out to every nation its portion according to its works, in His will, whose will is the law of things created. For so personally doth Scripture speak, speaking universally; “with Him,” it is written in Job¹, “is strength and wisdom, the deceived and the deceiver are His: He leadeth counsellors away spoiled, and maketh the judges fools: He looseth the bond of kings, and girdeth their loins with a girdle: He leadeth princes away spoiled, and overthroweth the mighty: He removeth away the speech of the trusty, and taketh away the understanding of the aged: He poureth contempt upon princes, and weakeneth the strength of the mighty:—He taketh away the heart of the chief of the people of the earth, and causeth them to wander in a wilderness where there is no way.” Nay it seems one object of the relations of the Old Testament to correct man’s Atheistic way of contemplating things, whereby he would substitute for the Living God some abstraction; as law or nature, or general Providence, or order of things, for the Giver and Maintainer of laws and nature,

¹ Chap. xii. 16 ad fin.

“ the Lord who will provide” and order all things ; and therefore it may be, doth God, in this place of Job and elsewhere, speak in such detail and so vividly, shewing that not only the ends but the means, not only the victory but the strength, not the power to persuade, but the eloquent speech, and the understanding of the experienced, are His, that He giveth or withholdeth, turneth them to foolishness or taketh them away, as He will. Not the great results only, (as men call great,) but the smallest, most insignificant means, every step of the countless multitudes who march along the high-way of God’s Providence, is ordered by Him, so that they should “ march^m every one on his ways, and not break their ranks, neither one thrust another, but walk every one in his path.” And hence God’s saints so often in holy Scripture confess, that all their power and wisdom and might cometh from Him, not in general terms only, but in particulars, that He “ girdethⁿ them with strength,” giveth swiftness to their feet^o, “ maketh them wiser than the aged^p,” “ teacheth their hands to war^q ;” for this faith in God’s aid and presence in details, is the life of all belief in His general Providence, and without this, that more general belief is little better than an empty abstraction.

But if the history of God’s dealings with the Jewish Church is a key to His governance of

^m Joel ii. 7, 8. ⁿ Ps. xviii. 33. ^o Ver. 33. ^p Ibid. cxix. 100. ^q Ibid. xviii. 34.

that His larger family, who had "gone away into a far country," to follow their own desires uncontrolled, much more is it to the governance of the Christian Church. For here we have not only the general correspondence of God's sovereignty, whereby the creatures of God's hands must either willingly, or against their will, be under His rule, must bear the sceptre or the rod of iron, and carry on His ends in their preservation or destruction, by their obedience or their perverseness, but we have the happier lot of being His family, the kingdom which He has chosen out of all nations to dwell in them. The Theocracy is continued, only invisibly. As God dwelt before by the Shechinah in the temple, so now the universal Christian Church is one temple, wherein it pleaseth Him to dwell, not now for a time—but "the Lord will abide in it for ever," by virtue of His own promise, "Lo! I am with you always, even to the end of the world."

We must not think of the law or its blessings as passed away; our Lord forbids it; what does not yet remain is *fulfilled*, *i. e.* filled up and realized, as an outline by the substance; the moral law remains; the ritual and the political had their fulfilment in Christ and His Church; the particular Providence of the Jewish people continues on in the Christian Church; only in the Christian higher far and more enduring, as the spiritual is higher than the civil Government, the relation of

^r Luke xv. 15.

sons than that of servants, Heaven than Canaan. "The whole kingdom of the Hebrew nation," says S. Augustine, "was one great prophet, because it prophesies of one Great One. In the actions as well as the words of their holy men must we look for prophecies of Christ *and His Church*; but for the rest of the nation, collectively in *God's dealings with them*. 'For all these things (as the Apostle says) were our ensamples,'" *i. e.* types and images of us. From the mutual connection of the Head and His members, the Jewish people, wherein they image forth our Lord, reflect also His Body, the Church, as well as in their more direct resemblance; nor is it in their waywardness, or their rebellions, or their turning back to Egypt only, that they shadow out individuals, but in God's dealings with them, they picture His dealings with His Church, which He formed into one in Christ out of them and of the Gentiles.

God's dealings with them, then, not only give instruction, (as any knowledge of God must,) but are a prophecy; peculiar situations of the Jewish people are prophetic warnings or encouragements; and it may be that a very minute correspondence will be found between the histories of the Jewish and Christian Church. At all events, we ought to look to striking occasions, where God's dealings were more visibly manifested, as grounds whereon to build our conduct and our hopes. The passage

* c. Faust. l. xxii. c. 24.

of the Red sea, to which the text refers, was one of those occasions ; its typical relation to the Christian Church, S. Paul has authoritatively declared ; and S. Matthew that of the Exodus, which it completed, to our Lord's call out of Egypt ; the Song of Moses, wherein he praised God for His mercies therein, itself looked on and furnished the form and language of other prophecy ; and its use in the Universal Church, as a hymn of praise, shews them to have recognized its continued Christian meaning and application.

At the very verge of that deliverance, thus solemnly commemorated in the Jewish and Christian Church, when the whole early people of God seemed to be in a great strait, entangled in the land, and shut in by the wilderness, the sea before them, and behind them " all the horses and chariots of Pharaoh, and his horsemen, and his army," Moses uttered the prophetic words, " Fear ye not, stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord." The peril was at its height, the Church seemed on the very brink of destruction, Egypt, the emblem of Antichrist, was ready to destroy, and there was no way left, when God " made the depths of the sea a way for His people, that the ransomed of the Lord might pass over*."

These words, which to fleshly Israel must have seemed so strange, and which to weak faith echo so strangely still, contain two parts, a duty and a

* Isaiah li. 10.

blessing. They are not mere words of encouragement; they impose a duty, and annex a blessing to its fulfilment. "Quietness and confidence" were to be "their strength." They were to "stand still," and so should they see the "salvation of God." And this condition of blessing runs continually through the whole history of the Jewish and Christian Church. As, namely, the first sin of man was trust in self and mistrust in God, so the correction has continually been, mistrust in self and trust in God. When God has tried His chosen servants or His chosen people, the most frequent trial perhaps has been this, whether they would tarry the Lord's leisure, be content to receive God's gift in God's way, take, at least, no wrong measures for obtaining it, hasten not, turn not to the right hand or the left; but "stand still," and "see the salvation of their God." They who have stood this trial have been eminent saints, the jewels of the Lord; they who have failed in this, have been like vessels, destined for some high use, but through this one flaw, marred in the fire which was to prove and form them. Even when unlawful means have not been used, yet the employment of any means, until God gave *the* means into the hand, were followed by pain and grief. Thus Abram and Sarai waited ten years for the promise, and then Abram hearkened to the voice of Sarai, and Ishmael was born; Ishmael too had a blessing for Abraham's willing faith, who resigned him, and his own hopes in him,

yet was he a grief to both Abraham and Sarah, and to their descendants. The child, whose birth they had wished for, themselves cast out, and "he who was born after the flesh," in himself and in his seed, "persecuted him who was born after the Spirit." By faith^t Moses slew the Egyptian; yet because this earnest zeal was not sufficiently subdued to do God's will and His only, he was forty years a stranger in the desert; and yet one like unbidden act cost him the land of Canaan. Jacob obtained the promise appointed to him before his birth; yet because he obtained it in the way of human device, "few and evil were the days of his pilgrimage;" Isaac waited twenty-one years for the fulfilment of the promise, and passed a peaceful life, strangely contrasted with his son's disquiet. Israel, in faithless fear of Ammon, asked for the king, who had been spoken of to them in the Law; and it became a sin and a snare to them; and God "consumed them and their king^u." Saul waited not for Samuel, for "fear the Philistines should come down upon him, and he had not made supplication unto the Lord;" and he was told for this first sin, "now would the Lord have established thy throne upon Israel for ever, but now thy kingdom shall not continue, because thou hast not kept that which the Lord commanded thee^x." David (of himself hasty and jealous) evinced himself the "man after God's own

^t Acts vii. 23, 24. ^u 1 Sam. xii. 25. ^x 1 Sam. xiii. 12--14.

heart," in preferring rather to be "hunted like a partridge on the mountains," than obtain that which God had promised him, until God should give it him. Jeroboam, though by nature what men call able and of a noble spirit⁷, by not waiting, and by human wisdom, became guilty of rebellion, his house was cut off, and himself became a proverb, with the miserable title, "who made Israel (the Lord's promised, chosen people) to sin." Baasha² and Jehu were raised up by God to execute judgment on their masters, yet because they did this, and joined therewith policy of their own, the blood which was righteously shed, was demanded of their hands, and God "avenged the blood of Jezreel on the house of Jehu⁴." "Asa's heart was perfect with the Lord^b," yet because he relied on the king of Syria for that wherein he should have relied on the Lord of Hosts, Hanani denounced God's judgments; "Herein thou hast done foolishly; therefore from henceforth thou shalt have wars^c." The inaugural visions of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, in different ways, lay the same burthen upon them, that they should be the willing spontaneous instruments of God; use no words of their own, but speak every word given them by God: as the Apostles were afterwards forbidden to premeditate what words they should use, but were to "speak what should be given them in that

⁷ See 1 Kings xi. 28.

² 1 Kings xv. 29. xvi. 2 and 7.

^a Hos. i. 4.

^b 1 Kings xv. 14.

^c 2 Chron. xvi. 7—9.

hour^d,”—an exercise at once of faith and faithfulness. And why speak of man, when He in whom our nature was restored, as a part of the restoration of that nature, and as an example of what should be realized in His members, underwent man’s three-fold trial “of the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eyes, and vain-glory^e,” in this same way, whether He would obtain for Himself that which was His, in any other way than that appointed; which when He had refused, “Satan,” we are told, had “ended all his temptation^f.” And He left to His disciples the same rule, and the same promise; “Ye shall be hated of all men for my name’s sake; but there shall not a hair of your head perish; in your patience possess ye your souls^g.” The disciple and the Church were to be hated like their Master and their Lord, to withstand in the same way, by patient self-possession of their souls, and with and through Him to stand. And, again, “Whosoever will save his life shall lose it, but whosoever will lose his life for My sake shall find it^h,” and “the meek shall inherit the earth.” Through patient suffering did the Son obtain the heathen for His inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for His possession; as He saidⁱ, “If I be lifted up from the earth, I shall draw all men unto Me.” “It is enough for the

^d Matt. x. 19, 20. Luke xii. 11, 12.

^e 1 John ii. 16.

^f Luke iv. 13. See S. Aug. on Ps. viii. 5. ult.

^g Luke

xxi. 17—19.

^h Luke ix. 24.

ⁱ John xii. 32.

disciple that he be as his Master." *Bypatient* (the word implies *suffering*) waiting for God, an unresisting resistance unto blood, did the Church take root in the whole world. It would seem as if S. Paul's imprisonment was a hindrance to the Gospel: so, it seems, he may himself have feared; this was the affliction of his bonds: but they "fell out *rather*," he writes^k, "to the furtherance of the Gospel;" the "bonds of S. Paul in Christ" carried the Gospel into the household and court of the Cæsar^l, and "in all other places," and gave confidence to many; as in later times, the captivity of Rome brought in the Gospel among the Vandals; and Christian slaves took captive their conquerors. The afflictions of the Thessalonians sounded out the Gospel to Macedonia and Achaia^m. "*The signs of an Apostle* were wrought among you," says S. Paul to the Corinthiansⁿ, "in all *endurance*," as well as in "signs and wonders and mighty deeds." "The work of an Evangelist," bequeathed by S. Paul to Timothy and his successors, was to "watch in all things, and to *endure hardships*°." It is a *Christian* proverb, (and proverbs become such by the frequency of their application,) that "the blood of martyrs was the seed of the Church:" the Gospel alone made known that non-resistance was strength, because "the strength of God was made perfect in

^k Phil. i. 12—14. ^l v. 13. and iv. 22. ^m I Thess. i. 6—8.
ⁿ 2 Cor. xii. 12. ^o 2 Tim. iv. 5.

weakness." "The more," says Origen^p, "kings and the rulers of nations and people every where afflicted them, the more they multiplied and prevailed exceedingly^q." The spiritual sons of the Gospels were multiplied by the self-same means as His chosen people in Egypt, by God's blessing on patient submission to injury. "We are multiplied," says Tertullian, "so often as we are mown down by you. The blood of Christians is seed^r."

^p c. Cels. vii. p. 713. ed. Ben.

^q Exod. i. 12.

^r Apol. c. 50. S. Aug. in Ps. lxx. s. 2. §. 4. strikingly connects the death of the Martyrs with that of their Lord: he places them in juxta-position only, yet so as to shew how he felt that it was from His Blood-shedding that theirs had their efficacy. "When Christ came, He was crucified, dead, rose again, called the Gentiles, they began to be converted, became Martyrs strong in Christ, the faithful blood was shed, the harvest of the Church arose. This was the youth of the Church." And again, Sermon. 287. in natal. Martyr. Protas. et Gervas. §. 3. "The Lord first died for him, as was meet, and Peter afterwards died for the Lord, in the order which was meet. The thorny road was first laid, and trodden down by the feet of Apostles, and so became smoother to those who were to follow. The earth was filled with Martyrs, as with the seed of blood, and from that seed arose the harvest of the Church. Dead, they testified to Christ more than alive. To-day they testify, to-day they preach; the tongue is mute, the deeds speak. They were seized, were bound, imprisoned, brought forth, racked, burnt, stoned, stricken down, set aloft for wild beasts. In all their deaths they were scoffed as despicable; but 'precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints.' Then 'precious in the sight of the Lord' only, now in our sight also. For then, when to be a Christian was a reproach, the death of the saints was despicable in man's sight;

And Justin^s, himself a Martyr, relates how, “when he was content with Platonism, the endurance of Christians, and their fearlessness of death, and every thing accounted fearful,” won his first attention to the Gospel. “When an ungodly man,” says S. Chrysostom^t, “bears rule, persecuting us on every side, and encompassing us with innumerable evils, then doth our state become bright and glorious.” And not in these only, but in the more fretting, because petty, oppressions to which they were exposed. “We were enjoined not to strive,” says Justin^u, “but through endurance and meekness to lead all from things shameful and evil desires. And this we can shew you in many cases, where men, from being violent and oppressors, were changed, being subdued either by narrow observation of a neighbour’s lasting endurance, or having noted the strange patience of fellow-travellers when defrauded, or having made trial of it in commercial intercourse.” And this the more illustrates their conduct under deeper suffering,—that they suffered, not simply because they must suffer or deny the faith, not because they could not resist, but because they ought not, and so would not. God forbid that we should so wrong the memory of the blessed

they were abhorred, held in execration: it was cast out as a curse, ‘So mayest thou die, so be crucified, so be burnt! What believer would not now long for such curses?’”

^s Apol. ii. §. 12. p. 96. ed. Ben.

^t De S. Babyla, §. 8.

^u Apol. i. §. 16. p. 53.

Martyrs, as to think, (as the degenerate Church of Rome now traduces them^p, lest she should seem to act contrary to them,) that they were Martyrs because they had not strength to resist; they were Martyrs, rather because they had strength *not* to resist, because they had strength to resist themselves. They “filled the world^q,” (I use their own language,) had “penetrated into every corner of it;” they were portions of the armies. Early as Tertullian the appeal was made, “You^r must decimate Carthage, if you would destroy us; spare thyself, if not us; if not thyself, spare Carthage.” “No one of us,” says a blessed Martyr^t of the same Church, “resists, when he is apprehended, nor avenges himself against your injustice and violence, although our people is an exceedingly numerous host,” (*nimius et copiosus*.) What, then, had the Christians turned against their destroyers, and employed against the worn-out and enervated

^p “If the Christians formerly did not depose Nero and Dioclesian and Julian the Apostate and Valens the Arian and the like, it was that they wanted secular strength.” Bellarmine de Pontif. Rom. l. v. c. 7. He adds, “But Christians are not bound, nay, they ought not, with evident peril of religion, [i. e. in man’s sight,] to tolerate an unbelieving king.” See others also ap. Bp. Taylor, Sermon on Nov. 5. Works, vol. vi. p. 612. ed. Heber.

^q Arnob. l. i. p. 27. cf. p. 9, 10.

^r Lactant. de M. P. c. 3. fin.

^s Ad Scap. c. 5. .

^t S. Cyprian, (quoted by Bp. Taylor, l. c. p. 613.) ad Demetrian. p. 192. ed. Fell.

luxury of the crumbling Empire that energy with which they upheld it, had they acted instead of suffering? Truly then they had lost their strength, avenged themselves on their enemies, and like Samson perished—as to their real life. But they “had not so learned Christ.” “The weapons of *their* warfare were not carnal, though mighty through God for the pulling down of strong-holds, casting down every high thing that exalteth itself, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.” They had been taught the lesson, which the heathen Emperor, when revealed to him, but half understood, ἐν τούτῳ νίκα; and women, the ignorant, the young, mechanics, peasants, overcame the learning and the strength of the world—by endurance; and then taught the might which they had conquered, to unlearn confidence in its own might, and that when they were weak, then were they strong^x: they overcame by the rack, by torture, by the fury of wild beasts, by the flames, by the red-hot iron seat, by pincers which mangled the flesh so that there remained scarce a vestige of the human form—not by using them, but by enduring them; they endured more than we could think human malice could invent, or human sufferance endure: and in truth it was not what it seemed, but satanic malice which invented, and Divine strength which endured,—and so the smoke of their earthly torment went up as a sweet savour to God, who for His Son’s sacri-

^x 2 Cor. x. 4, 5.

^{*} 2 Cor. xii. 10.

fice accepted this sacrifice, and their countenances being " marred more than the sons of men," became images of Him, " in whom the Father was well-pleased." They who could not be overcome, overcame; passiveness and unresistingness overcame the world; they overcame it by Him who had overcome it, by taking up His cross, and following Him. And as they hung upon His cross, emblems, as it were, and shadows, yea and members of Him, He imparted to their sufferings one part of the efficacy of His own, and they also, by His might, being " lifted up from the earth," drew all men—not to themselves, but—to Him, whose witnesses they were. " Christians," says S. Justin⁷, or one of his time, " abound more and more through suffering every day.—See you not how they are cast to the beasts, that they may be made deny their Lord, and are not overcome? See you not how they *abound, in proportion with the increase of their sufferings?* These things seem not like the work of men; but *they are the power of God, and indications of His presence.*"

And, afterwards, when the State oppressed the Church, and upheld a blasphemous heresy against it, it was by the same weapons that the Church prevailed, not obeying man, when God was the rather to be obeyed, yet suffering whatever man could inflict. It was amid Arian persecutions,

⁷ Ep. ad Diognet. translated in Tracts for the Times, Records, No. 15.

profaner in some respects than the heathen, that the five times exiled Saint, Athanasius the Great, upheld and transmitted to us the Catholic Doctrine, the rich reward of the exile and persecution of nearly half of his nearly half century's Episcopate ; it was by readiness to submit to all things that S. Ambrose and S. Basil retained the Churches of their provinces for the right faith ; " he is not liable to confiscation," answered S. Basil to the messenger of Valens', " who has nothing ; unless indeed you want these worn-out rags, and a few books, which are my whole substance. Exile I know not, who am not bounded by place, and neither regard this as mine, where I now live, and yet all, wherever I may be cast, as mine, or rather God's, with Whom I am a stranger and a sojourner. And what hold could tortures have, when they

γ Greg. Naz. Orat. Funeb. in Magn. Basil. §. 49. p. 807. ed. Ben. (cf. Greg. Nyss. c. Eunom. l. i. p. 313. ed. Morell.) Modestus had expressed his surprise that Basil did not fear. " B. What should I fear ; what suffer ? M. What ? Any one of the many things, which I can inflict. B. What are they ? tell me them. M. Confiscation, exile, tortures, death. B. If you have aught besides, threaten me therewith ; for none of these have any hold on me. M. How ?" This explains the form of S. Basil's answer, which is no declamation, but a simple answer to threats. Modestus remarked that he had never so been spoken to. " B. For perhaps you never met with a Bishop." Modestus returned to Valens, and said, " O king, we are conquered by him who is set over this Church. He is superior to threats, words, persuasions. You must try one of the less noble sort. Against him, you must either use open force, or not expect him to yield to threats." Valens yielded.

would find no body, except for the first stroke? for this alone is in your power. But death were a benefactor, for it would bring me sooner to God, to Whom I live, and serve, and for the most part have died, and have of old time been hastening.” “And thus,” says S. Gregory of Nyssa^y, “he was set forth by God, as Elias in the time of Ahab, and brought back all to the right way, engaging with those under authority, combating with generals, speaking fearlessly to kings, escaping the hold of his assailants; as having nothing whereby they might seize him.” S. Ambrose repressed the people who loved him, and overcame the Arian Emperor of the world by peril of death^z.

And when they received gifts from the State, it was not as mendicants, but as “priests of the most

^y Paneg. t. iii. p. 404. c. d.

^z “If you ask any thing of mine,” was S. Ambrose’s answer, when required to cede a Church to the Arians, “such as my estate, my money, or whatever else of this sort, I will not refuse, although every thing of mine belongs to the poor; but the things of God are not subject to the Emperor’s power. Seek ye my patrimony? enter on it; my person? I will yield it. Would ye hale me to prison or to death? it were a joy to me. I will not be fenced in by the encompassing multitude, nor lay hold of the altar, imploring for life, but more gladly will I be sacrificed for the altars.” Ep. 20. §. 8. And afterwards, “I may neither yield the Church, nor is it well for thee, O Emperor, to take it. Exalt not thyself; if thou wouldst continue to reign, be subject to God. It is written, ‘to God the things of God, the Cæsar’s to Cæsar.’ Palaces belong to the Emperor, Churches to the Priest. The public, not the sacred, walls are committed to thee.” Ib. §. 16.

High God;" they received them in the name of God, not for themselves, nor as "desiring a gift, but rather desiring fruit which might abound to the account^a" of the givers. It was by a readiness to make sacrifices, that the "riches of the Gentiles flowed in" unto them, when they seemed to be given not to men, (who cared not for them and were content not to receive them,) but to God, Whose ministers they were. S. Ambrose could then boldly and truly expostulate with Valentinian^b, whom they had almost persuaded to furnish the expenses of the heathen sacrifices, "What wilt thou answer to the priest when he saith to thee, The Church seeks not thy grants, because thou hast with grants adorned the temples of the Gentiles? The altar of Christ rejects thy gifts, because thou hast made an altar to idols." S. Laurence^c yielded up his life, not the treasure of the Church, committed to him, to profanation; he took not "the gold of the temple to give to the king of Assyria," and thus he saved the deposit committed to him, and by the constancy of his death gained to himself

^a Phil. iv. 17.

^b Ep. xvii. ad Valentinian. sect. 14. p. 827. ed. Bened. A characteristic saying is preserved of S. Thomas Aquinas. He found Innocent IV. counting money. "Innoc. The Church, you see, is no longer in the age, when she said, 'Silver and gold have I none.' S. Thom. True, holy father; but neither can she say to the sick of the palsy, 'Rise up and walk.'"

^c See the history at length in Tillemont Hist. Eccl. tom. iii. p. 16 sqq.

a greater treasure, the crown of martyrdom, and many souls, which he won to Christ.

It is for instruction only that we may ask why God should so have annexed the blessing of conquest to enduring suffering, and made patience mightier than what men call active virtues. One would not presume to think one knew all the grounds: it may be that they have some mysterious connection with the sufferings of Christ, which pass our understanding; and some such connection is indicated by S. Paul, "filling up what remaineth of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body's sake, which is the Church ^d"—as though it pleased God, that the union of Christ and His members should so be set forth, that as He is persecuted in His members, so the more eminent of His saints, who were more closely united with Him, knowing as S. Paul again says, "the fellowship of His sufferings, and being made conformable to His death ^e," should shadow Him forth, by suffering in the flesh for their brethren, emblems of His vicarious, though not of His meritorious, death. But vicarious suffering may be so far well-pleasing to God, as having a communion with the sufferings of His beloved Son, and doubtless it may make those, who are partakers of it, more capable ^f of the communication of the merits and influence of His Passion,

^d Col. i. 24.
Second Edition.

^e Phil. iii. 10.

^f See Preface to the

wherein they have been in a manner joined, being baptized with His baptism, and having drunk of His cup.

Then, also, it may be needful, in the wisdom of God, for the perfecting of His saints. As all trial implies pain, so the trial of the most precious vessels, it may be, is to be accomplished by pains proportionate. It seems not without special meaning that the analogy of gold is so often pointed out by Scripture. God sheweth us in this natural process an emblem of things spiritual. If even gold, which in the end perisheth, must yet be tried in the fire, how much more must faith, being more precious, so be proved ^f.

But, besides, it is evident that so God's power and glory is most shewn. "Then all men that see it shall say, This hath God done, for they shall perceive that it is His work ^g." There is a natural instinct, which recognizes that when things are too intricate for man, God will interpose. Heathen poetry speaks of a perplexity of affairs, which claims God to interfere ^h. A Jewish proverb says, "When Israel is brought to the brick-kilns, then cometh Moses;" a saying remarkably illustrated by the whole book of Judges. And Scripture itself has

^f 1 Pet. i. 7.

^g Psal. lxiv. 9. Pr. B.

^h Nec Deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus Acciderit. Hor. de A. P. 191. and the Greek *Θεὸς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς*. Our proverb, "Man's necessity is God's opportunity," and "When things are at the worst, they'll mend," express the same belief.

consecrated a like proverb, "In the mount of the Lord shall it be seen or providedⁱ," i. e. at the last moment, when faith and obedience have been tried to the uttermost, and there seemeth no help left, and that God would indeed exact what man could scarce endure, then would God from heaven avert the suffering, or crown the enduring faith by His blessing. "The Lord will provide." So Joseph rose from the dungeon, and Daniel from the lions' den, to rule empires for the sake of His people. The gallows were prepared, the edict issued, the whole scattered people of God given into their enemies' hand; the king passed one sleepless night, Esther ventured her life, the people was saved, the adversary hanged. Sennacherib^k had arrived at Nob; he was "shaking his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion;" on the morrow it was to be destroyed; "in that night the angel of the Lord went out; early in the morning they were all dead corpses^l." At S. Paul's first answer, "no man stood with him, all forsook him;" then "the Lord stood with him, and strengthened him^m."

Then, also, since man's self-will was the cause of his fall, when he would be wiser than God, and in his own way be as God, God would thus teach him to submit his own will, to renounce dependence upon himself, to quit his own wisdom and his own schemes, let every thing, if needs be, go

ⁱ Gen. xxii. 14.

^k Is. x. 32 sqq.

^l 2 Kings xix. 35.

^m 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17.

out of course, and then, "when the earth is weak and the inhabitants thereof," it will appear that the Lord "beareth up the pillars of it, and will say to the ungodly, Lift not up your horn, for God is the Judge; He putteth down one and setteth up another¹." It is a practising of our daily prayer, "Thy will be done in earth as it is in Heaven," a realizing, a qualifying for, a practising, a foretaste, of Heaven—to do God's will blindly, and consent that it may be done, cheerfully, without forecasting how it may end, whither it may lead, careful only about this, that it be His will. It is an Angel's life to obey unquestioning, and fits for Angelic duties and Angelic glories.

Lastly, there is room to fear lest, mingling in human schemes for her own security, the Church should leave her dependence upon God, and adopt insensibly the maxims of the world. "Resist not evil" is a precept plain in its *mode* of execution, though hard to fulfil; it prescribes a difficult but a plain track; but, admit the principle that man may resist evil, it is no longer easy to say where and how resistance begins to be sin. Man cannot avoid difficulties; they are essential to trial; he may, by shrinking from them, substitute greater, but cannot escape them. And this difficulty is increased by the very immensity of the interests at stake; all the enormities, which have given occasion in this respect to the enemies of God to blaspheme, have

¹ Ps. lxxv.

arisen out of principles in themselves indisputable. No one, for instance, could doubt of the superiority of things spiritual to things temporal, or that the office of a Bishop of Christ's flock was higher than that of a temporal sovereign ; that the sufferings of hell are so dreadful that any present agonies are blessings if they prevent them ; that men will be damned for wrong faith, as well as for unholy lives ; yet plain as these things are, out of men's misapplication of their duties regarding them, have arisen deposition of kings, absolving subjects from their oaths and allegiance, encouragement of murder, treason, rebellion, assassination, lying, perjury, cruelty, butchery of whole bodies at once, from which God saved *us* this day. From the time that the Church of Rome began to forsake the principles of the Church Catholic and grasp after human means, she began also to take evil means for good ends, and incurring the Apostolic curse on them who "do evil that good may come," took at last evil means for evil ends. She, the Apostolic Church of the West, consecrated by Apostolic blood, shewed herself rather the descendant of them who slew the Apostles, and "thought that they did God service," stained herself with the blood of the saints, that on her might come all the righteous blood which was shed within her ; even of the very Apostles, who had shed their blood for her. There is not an enormity which has been practised against people or kings by miscreants in the name of God, but

the divines of that unhappy Church have abetted or justified^e. And if she so fell, well may those

* See Bp. Taylor's learned Sermon on the Fifth of November. He gives, as cases, the justification of the murder of Henry the Third of France, (which the assassin indeed did on the authority of the divines he had asked, p. 583, 5, it was praised by Sixtus V. in full Consistory, p. 589, 90.) and of Henry the Fourth. (p. 585.) The Gunpowder plot was apologized for by Bellarmine and others, (ib. 586.) So also the Massacre of S. Bartholomew, (see below,) and the Irish Massacre of 1641 by Urban VIII. "whose joy thereat could not be expressed," (see ap. Rushworth, t. v. p. 504.) and who granted "a plenary indulgence and remission of all their sins, to the Catholic warriors who were labouring to extirpate the workers of iniquity, who infected the mass of Catholic purity with the leaven of heretical contagion." (ibid. p. 525 sqq.) On the "deposition of princes by the see of Rome," Bp. Taylor refers to Bellarmine quoting "twenty-one Italians, fourteen French, nine Germans, seven English and Scotch, nineteen Spaniards, and these all very famous and very leading authors:" (p. 601.) on the "lawfulness of a private man to murder princes condemned of heresy and tyranny," Bp. Taylor quotes some eminent authorities among them. (p. 605.) All through the reign of Queen Elizabeth attempts to assassinate were recommended by the Doctors, and blessed by the Bishop of Rome. See Nicholl on the Fifth of November Service.

It is, however, a remarkable but melancholy counterpart, that, previous to the Great Rebellion, non-conformist preachers maintained, that "for defence of religion, and reform of the Church, it is lawful to take arms against the king:" (Dugdale's Late Troubles, p. 73.) as did the Socinian Hoadly, that "we are only forbidden to resist good governors:" and the Statute of 1 W. and M. st. II. c. 2. §. 9. which not only excludes from the inheritance of the crown "any one who should be reconciled to, or hold communion with, the See or Church of Rome, profess the Popish religion, or marry a Papist," but declares "*the people in such case absolved from their allegiance,*" strangely agrees with the principles of the Church of Rome; for, as Bp. Taylor

“ who think they stand, take heed lest they fall.”

The principle then of Holy Scripture, as interpreted by the conduct of the martyrs and the early Church, is to await God's time, to suffer so long as He wills, not to help ourselves—to “ stand still, and see the salvation of God.” The principle of the Romish Church was expediency ; it was a plotting, scheming, worldly spirit, having at first God's glory for its end, but seeking it by secular means, and at last, in punishment, left to seek its own glory, and to set itself up in the place of God. Nor can we exempt other branches of the Reformation from the same faithless spirit ; the forfeiture, for instance, of Episcopacy by Calvin and his followers, was done in the same spirit as the sacrifice of Saul, or the support of the Ark by Uzzah whom God slew ; they acknowledged that *he* was to be anathematized ^h who might have Episcopacy, and had it not ;

argues in this case, “ it is plain that killing a prince is a certain consequent of deposing him, unless the prince—be bound not to resist, and as really give over his kingdom quietly, as he is bound. For if any of these should fail, there can be but very slender assurance of his life.” (p. 603.)

^h “ Let there be such a Hierarchy, in which Bishops shall in such wise be raised up, as not to refuse to be subject to Christ, depend on Him, as their only Head, and refer themselves to Him ; then I would confess that they are worthy of any anathema if any shall be found, who shall not shew to it reverence and the most implicit obedience.” Calvin de *necessitate reformandæ Ecclesiæ* v. fin. Opp. t. viii. p. 60. ed. Amstel. This and passages from other foreign Reformers are quoted by Bishop

but they could not ; and, with Saul, they offered the unbidden sacrifice, and with Uzzah touched the Ark of God's presence, lest it should fall, mistrusting God's power to raise it up. And so now the Church of Rome, who was Queen among the nations, is brought down to the dust under the nations, and is in bondage with her children ; and Geneva, which boasted of the purity of its doctrinal reformation, has been the seat of a worse Antichrist.

It is not (God knoweth) in any spirit of boast against those branches, some of which were grafted in before us, but still in encouragement and warning, that I would notice, that herein also our Church followed the principles of the Church Catholic, and with her had her portion. She alone of all the reformed Churches was purified in the fire, and purged by the blood of martyrs, and had the evidence of affliction that she was a beloved child and no bastard. And her general conduct has been true to her first principles, to render to Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's ; to do nothing against the command of God, but to suffer every thing which the Cæsar may require. It was thus that the seven Bishops mainly checked James's tyranny, refusing to do, but submitting to suffer, what

Hall, *Episcopacy by divine right*, p. 1. sect. 2. who mentions that this passage of Calvin is quoted with approbation by Chamier de membris Eccl. iv. 1.

was unlawful ; it was thus that even in the Great Rebellion men cheerfully took the spoiling of their goods ; it was thus that in events familiar to us, the members of this place^l, at different periods, suffered what was unlawful, rather than compromise their principles ;—and we cherish their memories.

The two events, for which we keep this day as an annual thanksgiving to God, together, strikingly illustrate these principles. 1. That we may safely leave things to God. 2. That there is great risk, that man, by any impatience of his, will mar the blessing which God designs for His Church.

In the plot, from which this day is named, God had permitted things to come to the uttermost ; every preparation was made, every scruple removed ; a Romanist^k had solemnly given the answer, that, for so great a benefit to the Church, Romanists too might be sacrificed ; the innocent might be slain, so that the guilty majority escaped not ; the last feeling of humanity, as one would have thought, that to members of their own Church, was extinguished. The secret was entrusted to but few, was guarded by the most solemn oaths and by the participation of the Holy Eucharist, had been kept for a year and a half, although all the Romanists in England knew that some great plot was being

^l In the times of the Great Rebellion and under James II.

^k Garnet the Jesuit priest [and others. Nicholl on the C. P.]

carried on, and were praying for its success; inferior plots had been forbidden by Rome, lest they should mar this great one; no suspicion had been excited, and there was nothing left to excite suspicion, when God employed means the most unlikely, put, just at the last, one lurking feeling of pity for one person in the breast of but one, so that a dark hint was given to that one: and He caused him who gave it, to miscalculate the character of his own brother-in-law, or entrust him with more than he was aware; then He placed fear in that other's breast, so that, through another and distant fear, he shewed the letter which contained this dark hint; then, when the councillors despised the anonymous hint, as an idle tale, He enlightened the mind of the monarch, to discover the dark saying, which to us it seems strange that any beforehand should have unravelled; and when even then the councillors had surveyed the very spot, and discovered nothing, He caused the monarch to persevere, undeterred, until He had brought the whole to light. Yet to see more of this mystery of God's providence, and how He weaves together the intricate web of human affairs, and places long before the hidden springs of things, one must think also, how He ordered that one of these few conspirators should be intermarried with one of the few Romanist peers, and so desired to save him; and how by the conspiracy from which God had shielded the monarch's early life, He

quicken'd his sense of the present danger; so that while men were marrying, and giving in marriage, and strengthening themselves by alliances, God was preparing the means whereby this kingdom should be saved against the will of those so employed; and while men were plotting against a sacred life, God was laying up in the monarch's soul the thought, which Himself should hereafter kindle to save it. Verily, "a man's heart deviseth his way, but the Lord directeth his steps^a." "The ways of man are before the eyes of the Lord, and He pondereth all his goings; his own iniquities shall take the wicked himself, and he shall be holden with the cords of his sins^b." The words of the Psalmist, selected for this day's service, find a striking completion in this history^c. "God^d hid him from the secret counsel of the wicked, from the insurrection of the workers of iniquity—they encourage themselves in an evil matter; they commune of laying snares privily; they say, Who shall see them? they search out iniquities; they accomplish a diligent search; the inward thought of every one of them, and the heart, is deep: but God shall shoot at them with an arrow; suddenly shall they be wounded; so they shall make their own tongue to fall upon themselves."

^a Prov. xvi. 9.

^b Ib. v. 21, 22.

^c See Barrow's Sermon on this text and day. Sermon. xi.

^d Ps. lxiv. 2 sqq.

But it yet more illustrates the teaching, and is an argument of encouragement to our Church, how God in two neighbouring countries permitted plots as atrocious to be accomplished. To human sight it is as strange that the massacre of S. Bartholomew should have been perpetrated, as that we should have escaped. The circumstances of that massacre even remind one of that destruction which extorted from the Heathen poet the confession, that it could not have been accomplished, “*si fata Deum, si mens non læva fuisset.*” The chiefs, on whom it fell, were men, the wisest of their age^a, practised in avoiding surprises, alive to treachery, taught caution by their profession; yet neither past treachery, nor present oft-repeated warnings^b, nor the half-completed assassination of the chief^c, as a herald of the

^a e. g. the Admiral Coligny.

^b Coligny was warned by very many both by word of mouth and letter. Thuanus, l. lii. p. 805. “He was especially warned sharply in a letter, of the decree of the Papists, that faith was not to be kept with heretics, of the queen’s Italian guile, and the king’s profaneness, hypocrisy, and cruelty from his youth: a conversation of the king with his mother was reported, in which he had boasted of his playing his part to the queen of Navarre, and had sworn frequently to her, that he would bring them all into her toils.” (ib. 806.) And again, by those of Rochelle, who, on being civilly put off, applied to the king of Navarre, but in vain; a play was enacted, in which the Protestants were represented as cast into Hell, which “some interpreted ill,” so that F. Earl of Montmorency left Paris.” (Ib. 808.)

^c The admiral. The shot came from the house of a Canon, preceptor of the Duke of Guise, and the assassin was connected with him. Coligny recognized it as the fruit of his reconcilia-

impending massacre, nor the forebodings of one^d “*Dei jussu non unquam creditus*,” nor the knowledge that their enemies, who had feigned a retreat, were still hard by^e, nor the menaces reported to them by their spies from those whom they were trusting^f, nor the bringing them together like sheep for the slaughter^g, nor the setting a well-known enemy as a guard to their chief^h, nor the com-

tion with him ; yet remained secure in Paris.” *Continuat. de Fleuri H. E. l. clxiii. §. 5.* “The tragedy,” said the Vidame de Chartres, “having begun with the wounding of Coligny, would soon end with the massacre of the rest ; he therefore advised to quit Paris instantly.” (*Ib. §. 12.*)

^d The Vidame de Chartres.

^e The princes of Guise, who feigned a rupture with the king ; “but it was known that they had not left Paris.” (*Ib. §. 13.*)

^f “Some Romanist courtiers, seeing the Calvinists leave the Church of Notre-Dame, not to hear the Mass at the marriage of the king of Navarre, had told them that their scruples would not last long ; their spies had heard from the servants of Charles de Gondy, the king’s Chamberlain, that more blood than wine would be spilled at that marriage.” (*Ib. §. 12. from De Thou, l. lii. p. 813.*)

^g “The king had made the greater part of the Protestant nobles and gentry lodge near the admiral. The captains of the quarters had orders speedily to mark the lodgings, to take in writing the names of those who professed Calvinism, and to collect them as much as possible in the neighbourhood of Coligny ; and H. M. said very loud, that every body might hear, that he forbid any Catholic to approach that neighbourhood, and would have any, who contravened this order, fired upon.” (*Ib. §. 15.*) “These and other indications,” adds De Thou, “and the reports every where whispered, had sufficed to warn the Protestants, if they had not been infatuated.” (*p. 814.*)

^h Cosseins, one of the greatest enemies of the admiral.

mencing tumults^l could wake them from the death-sleep of security which was to end in the sleep of death. "Instamus tamen immemores cæcique." "Surely," says Solomon, "in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird^k;" unless, adds Job, "God hath deprived her of wisdom, neither hath He imparted to her understanding^l." The deviser of the two plots was in both cases the same, papal Rome; she justified^m that which failed, and Gregory XIII. ordered, and himself attended, a procession and thanksgiving for that which succeededⁿ; both proposed the

^l "The admiral supposed that the tumults arose only from the people stimulated by the Guises, and that they would retire so soon as they saw the guard under the orders of Cosseins placed at his gate to defend him; he was not undeceived, until he learnt that his first gate had been forced, and that a musket had been fired in his court." (Ib. §. 20.) "A little before," says De Thou, p. 815, "observant persons had noticed that armed men were running to and fro in the city and round the Louvre; that the people were excited, threats every where heard, and thence they anticipated what would be; but Coligny only sent to inform the king, who assured him he had nothing to fear. At the same time, Teligni was told, that porters were carrying arms into the Louvre; but he despised the report, blamed such suspicions as needless, and forbad to inform Coligny of them."

^k Prov. i. 17.

^l Job xxxix. 17.

^m See above, p. 28.

ⁿ Ib. §. 40. Gregory also "struck some medals to perpetuate its memory; on one side of which was himself, on the other an angel holding a cross in one hand, and a sword in the other, exterminating heretics, and especially the admiral." "This he did," we are told, "regarding only the benefit which he ima-

same thing, the advancement of Romanism by the extinction of heretics; the one was carried on secretly, the other almost openly: of the one there were no intimations beforehand; in the other, they were frequent: the one seemed secure, being intrusted to a few; the other was in the hands of many: in the one, he on whom the execution depended, shrunk from sin so dreadful; Charles the Ninth, like Ahab whom Jezebel his wife stirred up, hesitated to the very last, and was ready to retract^o; in the other they had no compunctions, or had stifled them. The depth of guilt in the massacre of S. Bartholomew, (if any thing,) seemed the more to call down the avenging interference of God, through the multiplied hypocrisy and perjuries whereby it was carried on^p; yet the one, which every thing

gined must result from it to the Catholic religion in France." *Ib.* from the *Trésor Chronol. du P. de S. Romuald* in fol. p. 661.

^o "The queen, even at midnight, fearing lest the king, whom she thought she perceived still fluctuating and hesitating at the atrocity of the guilt, should change, went to his bedchamber, whither Anjou and others, and Guise, presently repaired, as agreed on. Then they relate, that after a long conversation to and fro, the king, when hesitating, was rebuked by his mother, for that by the delay he was letting slip so fair an occasion of subduing his enemies. At which speech, the king being of a very savage spirit and accustomed to shed blood, was fired, as being charged with cowardice, and gave orders for its execution. The queen, taking advantage of this impulse, lest he should relax, if an interval were given, hastened the signal, which was to have been given before day-break." *De Thou*, p. 816.

^p Especially on the part of Charles the Ninth. It was per-

earthly combined to overthrow, succeeded; the other, which every thing tended to ensure, failed. "Verily, there is a God that judgeth the earth."

"Thy way is in the sea, and Thy path in the great waters, and Thy footsteps are not known;" and it is Thou who "leddest Thy people like a flock^a," though by human hand. Far be it from us to say that we understand God's counsels; why in the one case He sent warnings, yet allowed the plot to be completed; in the other He sent none, but Himself destroyed it; He seemed to "take His rest, and to consider in His dwelling-place, like a clear heat upon herbs, like a cloud of dew in the heat of harvest," [as it were, Himself maturing and bringing about their devices,] "but afore the harvest, when the bud was perfect, and the flower become the ripening grape, He cut off the sprigs—and took away, and cut down the branches^b:" but this we must see, that those who were delivered (though not for their own merits) were passive, and that it was all God's hand; while the foreign Protestants, who perished, were an active, busy, scheming body, with worldly wisdom; and again we must with thankfulness acknowledge that it was the English Church whom God so preserved.

mitted, but avenged. His mother survived all her children but one, who was slain shortly afterwards, and she who had "made mothers childless," was "childless among women," her family extinct.

* Ps. lxxvii. 19, 20.

^b Is. xviii. 4, 5.

Yet even our much-distinguished and blessed Church has not been secure, when she forgot wherein "her great strength lay." In Ireland, for a time, she mingled her counsels with those of a different reformation^a, joined in turbulent proceedings against her earthly sovereign, and sunk her peculiar character in the cabals of earthly politics. Towards her Romanist fellow-subjects she preserved gentleness and peace, and they had been remarkably favoured^b. Yet "God brought fire out of the house of Abimelech to devour the men of Shechem;" her evil towards Charles He requited upon her own head from those whom she trusted, and among whom she dwelt securely. In this case, again, all things human combined to discover the plot, and in human sight its concealment seemed inexplicable^c;

^a "The British Protestants, transplanted in Ireland, having every moment before their eyes all the horrors of popery, had naturally been carried into the opposite extreme, and had *universally* adopted the highest principles and practices of the puritans. Monarchy, as well as the hierarchy, was become odious to them; and every method of limiting the authority of the crown, and detaching themselves from the king of England, was greedily adopted and pursued." Hume, Hist. c. 55, who proceeds to mention some of their measures against their king.

^b Sir J. Temple (an Irish Privy-Councillor), Irish Rebellion, p. 14, 15, 81. Declaration of Commons concerning the rise of the Grand Rebellion in Ireland, July 25, 1643, ap. Rushworth, p. iii. vol. ii. p. 346. Hume l. c. Lord Orrery ap. Nalson, Impartial Collection, vol. ii. p. 535.

^c "First, I must needs say, howsoever I have observed in the nature of the Irish such a kind of dull and deep reservedness, as makes them with much silence and secresie to carry on their business: yet I cannot but consider with great admiration how this mischievous plot, which was to be so generally at the

but again all the hints were neglected^d; the plot had been from six to eight years in preparation^e; it was well known in England, Spain, and other foreign countries^f; intimations were given to the king, and by him communicated^g, but neglected by those whose lives were threatened; revealed at last by one of the religion which was to be extirpated, but only when too late^h; the means of its execution were put into men's hands by those professedly most hostile to themⁱ; and a massacre,

same time, and at so many several places acted, and therefore necessarily known to so many several persons, should without any noise be brought to such maturity, as to arrive at the very point of execution, without any notice or intimation given to any two of that huge multitude of persons who were generally designed (as most of them did) to perish in it." Temple, p. 16, 17. The Long Parliament, to exculpate itself, and as a pretext for their rebellion, dared to ascribe the plot to our martyred Charles; but their statement of the utter unlikelihood of the plot in itself is illustrative. See Declaration of the Commons, ap. Rushworth, l. c. v. fin. See also Letter of Irish Council, ap. Nalson, p. 516.

^d Temple, p. 17. Nalson, ii. p. 519.

^e Temple, p. 67.

^f Testimony of the Popish priests named in Temple, p. 67.

^g By his Embassadors in Spain; see Rushworth, p. [408.] Nalson, ii. p. 565.

^h Temple, p. 18 sqq.

ⁱ The 8,000 men of the army raised by Strafford, which the Long Parliament detained and turned loose upon Ireland. Hume l. c. The Roman Catholic members joined in preventing their being sent abroad, as the king wished, on the plea that they might become disaffected, if they served with the Spaniards. Nalson, ii. 565. It is mentioned in Lord Macguire's account as one of the encouragements to the rebellion. Ib. 544. Hume names also as a ground, that "the Catholics assisted by the Protestants, had so diminished the royal prerogative, and

more horrible perhaps in its details of cruelty^k than any other upon record, fell unabated upon this portion of our Church; for "their Rock had sold them, and the Lord had shut them up^l."

And now we may perhaps the more readily learn our lesson from that other event, which has been included in this day's thanksgiving, the arrival on this day of him who became William III. Man's sin is no hindrance to thankfulness for God's mercy; rather, the more we sinned, the more should we be thankful to God for not giving us over to our sins, for making that, as it now is^m, at last legitimate to us and our duty, which in our forefathers was sin, yea, and for the chastisements with which He has visited our sins. The arrival of William was in itself, on God's part, a blessing; it was not, we may trust, on that of the Prince, a guilty act; at all events we may separate the mercy of God from the sin of man; it prevented further acts of tyranny on the part of James; it probably saved the nation from the miseries of

the power of the lieutenant, as would much facilitate any conspiracy."

^k "By the computation of the priests themselves that were present, and principal actors in all those tragedies, and were directed by some chief rebels of Ireland to take this computation, 154,000 Protestants, men, women, and children, were massacred between Oct. 23, and March 1." Declaration of Commons, l. c. The atrocious details are given at length by Sir J. Temple, p. 84 sqq. as attested upon oath. He computes the whole number destroyed at 300,000, men, women, and children. P. 6.

^l Deut. xxxii. 30.

^m See Preface, p. vi sqq.

anarchy and civil war, which but for his arrival, had men pursued the same course, might have followed, and in this the Church and nation might have been grievously injured ; and for this and for the preservation of our Church amid this convulsion, we have great cause of thankfulness. Further, it seems that their sin was not wilful, that they no more foresaw that they should end in dethroning the son^m, than Cromwell thought at first of murdering the father ; it may be too that our forefathers in a degree deceived themselves, and persuaded themselves, that because they did not *formally* dethrone their sovereign, they were not guilty of rebellion ; and it may be also that God, in His mercy, may have accepted this their shame, whereby they shrunk from their own act, and so mitigated His judgments : but it were in us but hypocrisy to use these pleas, and justify the action of our forefathers ; to say, that when a sovereign retreats from his kingdom before an advancing foreign army, his servants arrested, and his guards displaced, he is other than deposed ; that they who join herein are not guilty of rebellion ; and that they who in a self-called convention made the prince

^m The decision to appoint a king rather than a regent was carried only by *two* votes in the House of Lords ; and that, in the absence of those, who (as the Primate) held the whole meeting illegal. The revolution was obviously accomplished finally, by the refusal of William to accept of any thing short of the Crown, and the dread of consequent anarchy : *i. e.* they adopted a measure, which they would gladly have avoided, but which their first wrong steps forced upon them.

of Orange king, did not act against their allegiance to the sovereign, to whom they had plighted their faith. The misconduct of one justifies not the sin of another ; David, though of God anointed, lifted not his hand against him, who had been once anointed by God, though now his princely spirit was taken from him, and “ an evil spirit from the Lord came upon himⁿ ;” and so, while we thank God, we should humble ourselves, and pray Him, not to remember our sins, or the sins of our forefathers.

It is not without an apparent Providence that these two events are so brought together upon the same day ; the one, in which, without his own merit, man was passive, and God delivered him from extremest peril ; in the other, where, had men like our Bishops and a Confessor of this place^o, remained passive under the shadow of God’s wings, the tyranny had passed over, man interposed schemes of his own ; they did that, which their Lord upon the cross was taunted to do, but did not,—^p they “ saved themselves ;” and so they were permitted to mar the good purpose of God. I say, “ mar ;” for though God has been abundant in mercy, no one can have traced the state of our Church and nation, since that second rebellion, without seeing God’s judg-

ⁿ 1 Sam. xvi. 14 sqq.

^o Hough, President of Magdalen College.

^p “ What did He teach thee, in that He hung there, in that He would not come down, but endurance amidst taunts, but that thou shouldest be strong in Thy God.” S. Aug. Enarr. in Ps. lxx. Serm. i. §. 11.

ments, though tempered with mercy. Let any one ask when was the golden age of our Divines? All will say, the reign of Charles II., when their passive virtues had been called out, and they exercised by suffering. The last century every one as readily condemns as the deadest and shallowest period of English theology, and of the English Church. And this could be traced (were this the place) to the line which men took in resisting James's evil. The State feared and hated the Church, which it causelessly suspected; it could not understand that men might on principle object to the act which set the Sovereign on the throne, and yet upon principle obey, yea teach others cheerfully to obey, the Sovereign whom God had permitted to be so placed. It ejected a valuable portion of her members, the Nonjurors; divided, and so weakened her; cut off from her one element of teaching; gave her Bishops for secular ends^q, and profaned her offices to strengthen secular parties; wilfully corrupted her, and stirred up enemies against her and our Holy Faith^r. As clearly could it be shewn that the present storm, which lowers around our Church and State, is but a drawing out of the principles of what men have dared to call the "glorious revolution;" as that revolution (though in this

^q On the gradual usurpations of the Ministers of the Crown in the disposal of the higher offices of the Church, see a series of papers in the British Magazine, beginning from Feb. 1837.

^r See "Remarks on the benefits of Cathedral Institutions, and on Clerical Education," p. 124—128. ed. 2.

portion of our country, but still in this only, by God's mercy without bloodshed, as indeed, besides His other mercies, He generally restrains men in a second revolution, by an implanted instinct, from renewing the miseries of the first) was the sequel* and result of the first rebellion. The name given to the act of 1688 is no question of words; the very service of this day evinces the feeling even of such as could take the oath of allegiance to William, that it is not indifferent to God, how we look back upon His dealings with our forefathers: if we would not be partakers with other men's sins, we must disavow them; while we boast of them, we make ourselves sharers in them; if we would cut off the curse entailed by the fathers upon the children^t, we must disclaim the act which has entailed it; we should thankfully acknowledge God's "undeserved mercies," not glory in our fathers' sins, so may He exempt us from the impending chastisement.

Not so our Church, who in her most solemn service, acknowledges unto God, that kings "have His authority," that they "are His ministers." Even the service of the day, as far as it may in any degree, since she acquiesced in its adoption, be regarded as her voice, speaks of "the wisdom and justice of God's Providence," and we acknowledge it to be

* The lax principles, which had gained ground through the first rebellion, are strongly noticed, in the interval before 1688, in the writings already referred to, by Bp. Sanderson (especially §. xix.) and Dean Sherlock.

^t See Bp. Taylor's Sermon, "The Entailed Curse cut off."

such that James's evil fell upon his own head, that all his unrighteous acts hurt himself ; but she speaks not of our glory, but of " God's great and undeserved goodness." And again, the Homily on Rebellion seems by its very words prophetically to have denounced the measure wherein men now glory. " Had Englishmen," these are its words, " at that time known their duty to their prince set forth in God's word, would natural subjects have rebelled against their sovereign lord the king? Would English subjects have taken part against the king of England and Englishmen with the French [one need but change the nation] king and Frenchmen? Would they have sent for and received the Dauphin of France with a great army of Frenchmen into the realm of England? Would they have sworn fidelity to the Dauphin of France, breaking their oath of fidelity to their natural lord the king of England, and have stood under the Dauphin's banner displayed against the king of England? Would they have expelled their sovereign lord the king of England out of London, the chief city of England?" The parallel ceases ; if the Homily condemned the hard terms placed upon king John, much more would it the refusal of all terms to king James. The excuse that James was a bad king, in the sentiments of the Homily, but throws back the sin

^o Homily against Wilful Rebellion, pt. vi. p. 545. ed. Oxf. 1822. A Rubric for this day enjoins, that " if there be no Sermon, one of the six Homilies against Rebellion shall be read."

higher. "Shall subjects," it says^{*}, "obey valiant, stout, wise, and good princes, and contemn, disobey, and rebel—against undiscreet and evil governors? God forbid!—shall the subjects both by their wickedness provoke God, for their deserved punishment, to give them an undiscreet or evil prince, and also rebel against him and withal against God, who for the punishment of their sins did give them such a prince?"—And then it lays up, as it were, for future use, the remedy I have now been insisting on. "If^y we will have an evil prince (when God shall send such a one) taken away, and a good in his place, let us take away our wickedness, which provoketh God to place such a one over us, and God will either displace him, or of an evil prince make him a good prince, so that we first will change our evil into good—Else for subjects to deserve through their sins to have an evil prince and then to rebel against him, were double and treble evil, by provoking God more to plague them. Nay let us either deserve to have a good prince, or let us patiently suffer and obey such as we deserve." The Homily seems prophetically to have traced the line, on which we ought to have trodden, the blessings which promised to follow it, and the evils which ensued from forsaking it. And for the pretence of religion, as the Romish alone hitherto had been upheld by such means, it says^z, "what a religion

^{*} Homily against Wilful Rebellion, pt. i. p. 511, 2.

^y Ib. p. 512, 3.

^z Ib. pt. iv. p. 534, 5.

it is, that such men by such means would restore, may easily be judged; even as good a religion surely, as rebels be good men and obedient subjects, and as rebellion is a good mean of redress and reformation, being itself the greatest deformation^a of all that may possibly be."

Not so, again, the early Church; they resisted not evil; the whole city of Alexandria petitioned Julian to retain their Bishop, the saintly Athanasius, but rebelled not; the Christians of Gaul invited not the Barbarians to interfere and save them; the Christians held the balance of the Empire in their hands, yet even then took the fiercest of the ten persecutions patiently; the Christians of Persia implored not the Christian Emperors of Rome to interfere with armed force against those into whose hands God had given them to try them; "they were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might

^a Montaigne has a passage remarkably according with the language and sentiments of the Homilies, *Essais*, l. iii. c. 12. After denying that there could be any evil in a government, which should be cured by a drug so deadly, he says, "*What impiety is it, not to look for, from God, any aid simply His, and without our cooperation.*" I often marvel, whether among so many, who trouble themselves with these necessities of the State, there was ever one, of intellect so weak, as to be in good earnest persuaded, that he was promoting a *reformation* by the worst of *deformations*; that he was advancing towards his own salvation, by the most direct causes which we have of a most certain damnation, that overthrowing the state, magistracy, and the laws, under the guardianship of which God has placed him—he can render any aid to the all-holy tenderness and justice of the Divine Law."

attain a better resurrection," and so in God's good time, the giant statue crumbled in its very base, and the stone cut out without hands "filled the earth."

Not so, lastly, holy Scripture, which that Church well understood. If slaves were to obey "froward masters," much more, argues our Homily^b, ought subjects "sharp and rigorous princes." Scripture bids us obey princes "not only for wrath but for conscience sake;" it knows not our subtle distinctions of "social compact^c;" it bids us peremptorily

^b l. c. pt. i. p. 509.

^c This is, in these days, assumed as an axiom, as men's wont is, when they give themselves little pains to understand their own principles: the strong contrary statements of Bishop Sanderson may cause some to re-consider their views. "As for those in the next place that would derive the original of all Government from the People by way of pact or contract: it may suffice to say, that they take that for granted which never yet was proved, nor (I dare say) will ever be proved while the world standeth, either from Scripture, Reason, or History. Jus gladii, the right and power of the sword (which is really the Sovereign Power) belongeth, we know, to kings, but it is by the ordinance of God, not the donation of the people: for he beareth the sword (St. Paul telleth us) as God's minister, from Whom he received it; and not as the people's minister, who had no right to give it because they never had it themselves. If any shall say they had, the proof lieth on their part, to shew how they came by it; whether God gave it them, or they took it themselves. If God gave it them, let it be made appear when and where the first grant was made; let some evidence be produced to justify the claim, or at least some credible testimony, or frequent presumption to render it probable that there was some such thing done, though the records be lost. If none of all this can be done, it remaineth, that if they had it, they

obey kings, and what kings^d? what compact, not with their subjects, but with human nature itself, had not Caligula and Claudius and Nero broken? and it may be God gave the Roman Empire such prodigies of wickedness then, that Christians might have no excuse to rebel. No one can doubt but that S. Paul would have taken his lot with our outcast Bishops; and if this be so obvious that one dare scarcely put the case from this place, how dare we call that "glorious" which he would have condemned? Had it been glorious, "to God's name should have been the praise, for His mercy and truth's sake;" but now since it was men's act, they take to themselves the glory, when all was God's "undeserved mercy," and glory in their shame. Rather let us take to ourselves the shame, and give to God the glory, for not having "dealt with us after our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities;" let us thank Him for His "great and undeserved mercies."

took it. And if they so did, it was saucily and sacrilegiously done at the first; and by our Saviour's presage, (Matt. xxvi. 52.) like enough to prosper with them accordingly at the last." Bishop Sanderson's preface to Archbishop Usher's *Power of the Prince*, sect. 15. After which he proceeds to expose several of the difficulties involved in the assumption.

^d "This (1 Tim. ii. 1, &c.) is S. Paul's counsel. And who, I pray you, was prince over the most part of Christians when God's Holy Spirit by S. Paul's pen gave them this lesson? Forsooth Caligula, Claudius, or Nero; who were not only no Christians but pagans, and also either foolish rulers, or most cruel tyrants." *Homilies*, ib. p. i. p. 513.

If ever these lessons were of moment, they seem likely to be so now, and we have reason to thank God for His Providence in so connecting the events of these two days, that their commemoration should be a yearly warning to us, in a way which they who appointed the latter festival^e thought not of. What times are coming upon the earth, we know not, but the general expectation of persons of all characters in all nations is an instinct implanted by God to warn us of a coming storm. Not one nation only, but all; not one class of thinkers, but all; they who fear and they who hope, and who fear and hope things opposite; they who are immersed in their worldly schemes, and they who look for some "coming of God's kingdom;" they who watch this world's signs and they who watch for the next, alike have their eyes intently fixed on somewhat which is coming, though whether it be the vials of His wrath, or the glories of His kingdom, or whether the one shall be the herald to the other, none can tell. They who can calculate what is likely, speak of it; they who cannot, *feel* its coming; the spirits of the unseen world seem to be approaching to us, and "awe comes on us, and trembling, which maketh all the bones to shake^f," "all nations

^e It was appointed not by, but rather against, the Church, and used as an instrument of oppression to her, a snare to the consciences of her ministers, and a political test against men who would have yielded a peaceable obedience.

^f Job iv. 14, 15.

are shaken^g;" the sound, which for these many years has been heard and spoken of from this place^h, has been waxing louder and louder, and spreading wider: there is "upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earthⁱ." Times of trouble there have been before; but such a time in which every thing every where tends in one direction, to one mighty struggle of one sort, of faith with infidelity, lawlessness with rule, Christ with Antichrist, there seems never to have been till now. The ancient images of Antichrist are growing old, and decaying; and a more fearful Antichristian power, that of popular lawlessness, which maketh its will its God, and will own neither God nor man but its own rule, seems to be held in, not by the weak threads of human rule, which it would snap "as flax burnt by the fire," but by the Almighty power of God, discovering His might in human weak-

^g Haggai, ii. 7.

^h The writer recollects in younger years, how, before any overt public act had taken place, such as must force upon men's minds the expectation of further changes, persons were, in this place, warned that evil times were coming, that the clouds were gathering, that there was a diseased tone in the public feeling, a distempered appetite; and these warnings became the more impressive, as they came from persons of different character, and who had derived their impressions from different sources. Now we are become accustomed to our evils, and what then was regarded by sound judges as a symptom of disease, is now regarded as a common thing.

ⁱ Luke xxi. 25, 26.

ness. These are "fig-tree signs," whether "our redemption" indeed "draweth nigh," and this long warfare of this world be at last almost accomplished, or whether it shall be but some fuller image of that long longed-for coming, which shall be revealed, we cannot tell; enough for us that we have signs that God is more than heretofore visiting the earth, and that Satan more than heretofore is let loose upon it; that persons must and are taking their sides more decisively with Christ or with Belial.

Whether then this fearful conflict burst in our days, or when we are withdrawn, let those who live to share it, or any portion of it, recollect that our strength is to "fear not, stand still, and wait for the salvation of God." God hath shewn great mercies to our Church, as on this day, and those greater than to any other nation; trust we Him. Even now He seems, contrary to His dealings with all other nations, to have checked the waywardness of our course, and though we had done things displeasing in His sight, to be restoring us from the feverish sickness, wherein we had fallen, and bid us "go our way, and sin no more, lest a worse thing happen unto us." It is our duty indeed, as they did of old, to warn men of the great sin and danger of sacrilege, or apostasy, or interfering with the Church of God, or polluting her offices, or indifference and promoting error, lest we be guilty of the blood of others, if we warn them not; and in all lawful ways permitted to us, we are bound

to extend truth, diffuse right principles, as well as adorn them in our lives; but this done, recollect we, that our armour is not like that of the Romish Church, "the wisdom of this world, which shall come to nought," earthly activity and worldly schemes, but humiliation, acknowledgment of our past sins, prayers, fasting, watching, endurance, submission to men, and patient tarrying for God. Let the Church use these, use the Psalms and the prayers put into her hands and her mouth, use them not as forms but as realities, realize to herself that a great contest *is* going on between the dragon and the woman in the wilderness, and that prayers are the arms of the saints; feel that the welfare of each, his spiritual privileges, are bound up in the welfare of the whole Church, but that, besides, he ought to love the whole for herself, as the spouse and body of Christ: recollect that "the hearts of kings are in His rule and governance," and that He "stilleth the madness of the people;" pray, as our Church with the antient Church does, twice each day, "for the whole world, for kings and all that are in authority"—and they who seem to be hurrying on things with rapidity so fearful, will be found but to be bound around the wheels of God's Providence, not leading events but dragged along by them, to accomplish by their self- or free-will "whatsoever His hand and His counsel determined before to be done^k." "Surely the wrath of man shall praise Thee; the remainder

^k Acts iv. 28.

of wrath shalt Thou restrain." God warneth us by the very swiftness with which all things are moving around us, that it is He who is impelling them ; man cannot impart such speed, nor rouse the winds from the four quarters of the heavens, nor bring men's varying wills towards one uniform result ; and therewith He warns us to beware how we attempt to guide, what He thus manifestly is governing. As the trial of our faith is increased by the greatness of the interests at stake, so is it lightened by God's more visible Presence, which would awe us into confidence and quiet. The " Egyptians are behind" us, but the " pillar of the cloud" is between us and them. He will " remove the chariot wheels" of the enemy, though they drive on never so furiously. Those things only can be marred, which we ourselves mar. He would have us do our plain duty quietly, suffer evil, if needs be, patiently, and then await the end, placing our confidence not in our own strength, nor in the wisdom or numbers of any secular party, but in Him.

And let the young especially remember, that it is not by giving vent to their feelings, but by restraining them ; not by blaming others, (in doing which they could scarcely avoid sin,) but by schooling themselves ; by meekness, by self-command, by quietness, by peaceableness, by disciplining themselves, and by acting under discipline, by submitting to authority, even when they see not presently the reason, by acting, in their petty occasions, on faith, that they may best prepare

themselves for whatever duties, in the great army of their God, it may please Him hereafter to call them to.

In brief, then, we may not be over-anxious even about holy things, such as the deliverance of the Church from unjust thralldom or from spiritual disadvantages. God allowed His chosen people to lie in bondage 400 years, and not till the set time was come, did He judge that power which enthralled them; and when afterwards He delivered them for their sins to Nebuchadnezzar, "they were to seek the peace of the city whither He had caused them to be carried captive, and after 70 years to be visited¹." They "stood still" till Cyrus came, they invited him not, helped him not, but he acknowledged that "their God, the King of heaven, had given him all the kingdoms of the earth, and given him in charge to build His temple at Jerusalem^m." God is visibly working, and preparing the army, which "shall be willing in the day of His powerⁿ;" but it is His day, His army, His power, and He must "give the word^o." As of old the feet of the image were crumbling, the world was growing old, institutions were dissolving, but the people of God might not put a finger thereto, but "a stone cut out of the mountain *without hands* smote it, and brake it in pieces;" so must it be now: whether it please God to breathe fresh life into the old institu-

¹ Jerem. xxix. 7, 10.

^m Ezra i. 2.

ⁿ Ps. cx. 3.

^o Ps. lxxviii. 11.

tions of the world, or whether “ He take away their breath, and they return to their dust,” it must be His doing, not man’s; what God doth, that is well done; we might mingle “ hay, straw, and stubble” with His work, which in the day of trial will not abide. “ O tarry thou the Lord’s leisure; be strong, and He shall comfort thy heart^p.” “ though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry^q.” “ O Lord God of hosts, blessed is the man that putteth his trust in Thee!^r”

^p Ps. xxvii. 16.

^q Hab. ii. 3.

^r Ps. lxxxiv. 13.

O Lord, we beseech Thee to keep Thy Church and household continually in Thy true religion; that they who do lean only upon the hope of Thy heavenly grace, may evermore be defended by Thy mighty power; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen^s.

^s Collect for the Fifth Sunday after Epiphany.

APPENDIX I.

Remarks on some Statements in the " Doctrine of Passive Obedience contrary to Holy Scripture, by a Clergyman."

THE short interval which has elapsed since the first publication of this Sermon, has given room to few remarks upon it, so there is but little to observe. And indeed the doctrine contained in it, however contrary to the recognized maxims of many politicians, is probably still, if half unconsciously, that of religious people, and like a large body of sound principles besides, requires but to be stated, in order to be recognized as the truth and as having been previously, if less distinctly, held. There has been, happily, little occasion for its direct application, and so the better sort have been content to hold it in a general way, without applying it to any specific cases, or accurately settling its limits, or ascertaining whether they were consistent in admitting *any* exceptions or limitations to it, or whether Holy Scripture allowed of this. And many, doubtless, hold the doctrine as a whole, who have been taught to look upon the act of 1688 as an exception. Yet it cannot be too often inculcated, that the mind in every way is continually striving to right itself, and rid itself of inconsistency: and so it repeatedly happens, that the exception, if it be of any moment, will become the rule. In moral habits, as in maxims, or doctrines, a single allowed exception will nullify the force and influence of that which appears to be recognized or practised with almost the full consent of the mind or

will. There is danger to any principle or practice, as long as there is any opposed habit of thinking or acting, however slight. A single exception unnerves moral action, and loosens the hold of belief. Any exception to the doctrine of plenary inspiration, however minute the subject-matter, has prepared for the rejection of the whole; any unsoundness in what seemed the slightest shade of religious belief has ushered in entire unbelief; just as the slightest "letting out of water" is a token of the giving way of a barrier, the breaking down whereof deluges a whole country; or the slightest bowing of a wall is a prelude that it will in time fall; or a particle of decay in an apparently vigorous and flourishing tree an earnest that it will perish. It is then of more moment than many are aware, how we form our views upon any given point; it is not matter of historical speculation, or contentiousness about an abstract point, but an earnest practical question, whether we look upon the Revolution of 1688 as "glorious or inglorious." Uncompromisingness and unbendingness is the very condition of sound faith, moral action, right principle, consistent conduct, and, in detail, of any Christian grace, or virtuous habit; of honesty, for instance, or purity, as indeed is proverbial. One exception undoes more than many contrary actions do towards completeness. One, who admits habitually of any one exception however slight, to a given course of right action, is probably much less removed from him who is sunk lowest in the scale, than from perfect consistency. In the present case, our whole tone of feeling about the act of 1688 has, in the century and a half which has since elapsed, altogether varied from that of those who committed it; let any one read, in any common history, the account of the debates, doubts, palliations of those who were concerned in it, and contrast these with the exulting, or (which is more) the matter-of-course way, in which the "glorious Revolution"

is now spoken of, and he must vividly feel, that our principles of obedience are sunk very far below those of that time. Probably we are more akin, on the whole, to those who perpetrated the Revolution of 1793, than to the Christian submissiveness of the first ages of the Gospel; and if so, it will be of God's great mercy, but far more than man has any right to anticipate, if many of the atrocities of that last "atrocious Revolution" be not re-enacted among us, and London become not a Paris.

The few exceptions which have been lately taken to the principle of uniform passive obedience here inculcated have been such, as persons are wont to make, on the revival of doctrines, which for a time have slept, though they are, in truth, the uniform teaching of the great divines of our Church. Two or three points, however, have been noticed, by one, (on internal evidence a very young writer,) which since they have probably been felt by others, it may be well to clear up.

It is a vulgar error, that, because the King cannot rightly legislate without the counsel of his Parliament, therefore, the supreme power is divided between the King and his Parliament; and this is so taken, not only as matter of *fact*, but as matter of duty; that because the authority of the Sovereign is in some respects limited by law, therefore our allegiance no longer belongs to him alone, but is transferred to those institutions, by which it is limited; that "the Divine authority is lodged in the three [King, Lords, and Commons] conjointly," and so that our allegiance lies distributed among them. Hence it has been inferred, that if one "section of the supreme

* Doctrine of Passive Obedience to Kings *contrary* to Holy Scripture, by a Clergyman, p. 13.

power would tread under foot the laws by which its own rights are bounded, the remainder of the supreme powers are charged with the duty of restraining or chastising the unruly member^b;" i. e. in other words, if a king violates the laws, it is a sacred duty to chastise him !

This is probably a popular doctrine, in a sense other than this young writer takes it; for men like to be under the rule of an abstraction rather than of a personal being. To be under the rule of a *person* is something humiliating; the will is subjected to the will of another; but to be under the rule of an abstraction, as law, government, and the like, is to be under no rule at all, or, at the worst, one which we can change ourselves, or at least it keeps the ruler more out of sight. On the same principle, people speak of the Deity, the Divinity, Providence, Nature, as reminding them less of a Personal God, to Whom they are responsible, and Who, by His will, rules and controls theirs. And so it seems an ennobling thing to be under the rule of laws, both because the source of authority is thus shewn to emanate from ourselves, and we are in fact but paying obedience to our own will; and yet again, we seem to have yielded up some of the freedom of that will for a more enlarged good, and of our own free-will to obey, and still feel that we need no longer obey than our own collected will approves. Thus obeying, we are not subjected to a power without us, further that we have ourselves delegated the authority, and may resume it, when we will; in short, we are to govern ourselves, not be under the government of another. And this is the object of the democratic principle now at work throughout Europe.

It is an obvious answer to the fallacy of divided allegiance thus assumed, that no one takes an oath of allegiance to the Lords or Commons, nor to the laws, (although,

^b Ibid. p. 15.

when they interfere with no higher law, we are bound to obey them, and it is in truth the Sovereign whom we obey in them, though legislating with the advice of that Court which he summons to deliberate *under* him^c;) nor to any abstraction whatever, but to the Sovereign personally; and that not ordinary subjects, but the Members of Parliament, i. e. those who are supposed on this theory to be in their collective capacity the object of allegiance, take that oath of allegiance; that it is accidental only that the Sovereign has to call the Parliament together at all; that there is no treason against Lords or Commons or "the majesty of the people," but that it lies against the person of the Sovereign only. The whole fallacy, however, arises from the modern misapplication of the term "three estates of the realm," which historically means, the Peers, Commons, and Clergy, but which, now that men have ceased to look upon the Clergy as one estate, they have supplied ignorantly with the name of the King, and so confused all their notions about government. But, in truth, the King is "supreme," and although he can legally perform some acts only by assistance of his Privy Council, others by aid of his Parliament, yet the Sovereign, and the Sovereign only, is the source of authority and the object of allegiance.

Again, the maxim that "a king can do no wrong," is "an ancient and fundamental maxim," and this is explained even by an eminent lawyer^d *since* the Revolution of 1688,

^c "Under our most religious and gracious Queen at this time assembled." Prayer for the High Court of Parliament.

^d Sir Wm. Blackstone, b. i. p. 246. He accordingly retains the older view, that in 1688 the king's withdrawing himself out of the kingdom, was essential to the "abdication" and consequent vacancy of the throne; p. 245. and so does not regard the Revolution as involving the right of subjects to depose their sovereign, even on the breach of the supposed original contract.

that "whatever is exceptionable in the conduct of public affairs is not to be imputed to the king, *nor is he answerable for it personally to his people.*" The contrivance that he should do nothing at all, is an attempt to maintain ancient principles which have a hold upon the conscience, without sacrificing the licence of modern practice. The application of the maxim, so as to make every act responsible, yet to keep the Monarch irresponsible, gives rise, occasionally, to absurdities which in themselves shew, that the maxim was meant to declare the king irresponsible, but that its authors did not contemplate the uniform responsibility of any other. Practice still leaves the king in some sense free to do things, and so an awkward fiction is contrived to make others responsible for what they had no share in. The maxim implies then a higher monarchical authority, as a "fundamental" principle; that the king was free, and yet irresponsible.

A theory, on the contrary, which is obliged to resort to God's deliverance of Israel by Moses, for a "sanction of the right committed by God to a people unjustly enslaved to free themselves from the tyranny of their oppressors^d," and to His grant of the ten tribes to Jeroboam for a proof that "all rebellion against a monarch is not in itself unlawful^e," may proceed in the next place to justify the "glorious" tyrannicide of Harmodius and Aristogiton (so at least the blind though civilized heathen thought it) by the example of Ehud, or treachery by the inspired action of Jael, and would find it impossible to elude the principles upon which the see of Rome justifies rebellion or assassination, when required, as they deem, by "spiritual ends^f." Far better indeed

^d Doctrine of Passive Obedience, &c. p. 19.

^e *Ibid.* p. 21.

^f Bellarmine de Pont. Rom. v. 6. ap. Taylor, Sermon on Nov. 5, t. vi. p. 604.

were it to be at the mercy of the see of Rome in her worst days, than to allow the people to be the judge when the Monarch is guilty of a "lawless aggression against the powers and privileges" of Lords and *Commons!* or of "an act of rebellion against the ordinance of God^h." Leaving such arguments as these, let people admit teachably the doctrine of Holy Scripture, and not tamper with their consciences by abstract theories, and they will see clearly what the duty of subjects is.

"What I have said of master and slave, understand ye also," says S. Augustineⁱ, "of potentates and kings, and all the heads of this world. Sometimes the "powers that be" are good, and fear God; sometimes they fear not God. Julian was an infidel Emperor, was an apostate, unjust, an idolater; Christian soldiers served an infidel Emperor; when it came to the cause of Christ, they acknowledged Him only who is in Heaven. If he would that they should worship idols, offer incense, they preferred God to him; but when he said, 'March; go against that nation,' forthwith they obeyed. They distinguished their temporal lord from their eternal Lord, and yet, for the sake of their eternal Lord, were subject also to the temporal lord."

With regard to the Service of the day, the author meant to point out a sense in which those who might be present in churches where it was used, might without discomfort join in it, although they look upon the Revolution of 1688 as an act of rebellion on the part of the nation, as unnatural and undutiful conduct on the part of the children of the dethroned Monarch. It is, in such cases, best to join in devotion in such sense as we can, to thank God for those

ⁱ Doctrine of Passive Obedience, &c. p. 13.

^h Ibid. p. 16.

^h Enarr. in Ps. 124. §. 7.

things for which we can thank Him, even if we cannot join in the sense in which the writers of the prayers may have intended them. At the same time it must be observed, that as at the time, the actors in that Rebellion had great scruples, and spoke of their own act very differently from moderns, and would have been ashamed of, and repudiated, modern panegyrics; so also does the Service, though unsatisfactory, speak in a different tone from modern times, and is *so far* a witness against them. The authors of that Service abstained altogether from speaking of human agency; of the subjects, who owed allegiance to James, nothing is said or implied; they only speak of the work of Divine Providence as a whole, that He caused "all opposition to fall before William," that He "delivered the Church and nation from Popish tyranny and arbitrary power;"—and the flight of James II. *was* a remarkable instance of infatuation, such infatuation as the very heathen would ascribe to the direct agency of God; "Quos Deus vult perdere, dementat prius." The utter and sudden destruction, again, of the prospects of Popery by the very means which were taken to advance it, the sudden melting away of James's power, and his disappearance without a struggle from the land, where he ruled ungodlily, were "marvellous in men's eyes;" only, would that man's sin had not been mingled with God's deliverance, and so worse evils, than even Popery, been entailed upon us! It would even seem from the language, "making all opposition to fall before him, until he became our king and governor," that the writer or writers adopted the excuse, current at the time, devised by Lloyd, Bishop of St. Asaph, and which had, we are told, "the most universal effect on the far greater number of the Clergy¹," that William obtained the crown by conquest; only, as they explained it, not over the

¹ Burnet, v. fin.

kingdom, which did not oppose him, but over the king^k; and thus they set aside altogether the question of any resistance of subjects to a king. They had been spectators only of the deliverance wrought for them. As an argumentum ad hominem, then, the appeal to the Service is valid; even they who justified the act of 1688, justified it on grounds, which would condemn the present generation; they would have condemned themselves, had they acted on the principles on which moderns take it for granted that they acted. They avoided admitting the principle, even while they sanctioned the act. They could satisfy themselves that James's subjects had no share in his abdication; and could one take this view of the fact, the rest would be plain. The Service then takes a right view upon wrong data; they persuaded themselves that William was called in only to mediate, not to support subjects against their sovereign, and that James was removed by God not by man, and had left his throne vacant; were this so, one might readily take the rest of their view, and had this been so, the whole of our subsequent, and, still more, the impending history of our country, had been very different.

Reverting however to the Service of the day, the author cannot understand how any Clergyman, who has any scruple of conscience, can be held responsible to use a Service, which the Church has admitted only, but to which she has given no formal sanction, even through the unsatisfactory medium of Convocation. For himself he would prefer using the original Service for the day, which *was* recognized by Convocation, and omitting the subsequent interpolations relating to William III. It is with the original deliverance wrought by God, not with that wherein man mingled, that

^k The lawyers, to escape the same difficulty, proposed the same theory, that William should claim the throne by conquest. Hume, &c.

the solemnity of the day is in almost every mind associated. Least of all, however, is it to be thought that the case of those who dislike this portion of the service for Nov. 5, is at all parallel to theirs, who object to portions of the Catechism, the Services of Baptism, Confirmation, Matrimony, Visitation of the Sick, and Burial of the Dead. For these imply doctrines, these are wound up with the character of our Church; our Church has solemnly recognized, and we have solemnly bound ourselves to use them; our Church would be altogether different from what she is, if she had not the very expressions which are by some objected to, or not taken in a literal sense. These a Clergyman is bound to use, although it would be obviously his duty to remain as a layman, though he could not minister, in the Church, if he could not assent to them; the expressions in the Service relating to William III. have no claims whatever upon us, unless they be enforced upon us by our Diocesan.

There is another topic, which it is well to notice, rather as a protest against the habits of the day, than as at all necessary in itself. The young "Clergyman"^k calls upon me to "explain the real sense of the words" p. 25, that "suffering may make those who are partakers of it, more capable of the communication of the merits and influence of His Passion," which he says "if we take them in their natural sense must necessarily contradict the Thirteenth Art." It were sufficient to refer to the context of the passage thus selected, wherein I was speaking of "the members of Christ," of His being "persecuted in His members," of "the most eminent of His saints," of having been "baptized with His baptism." What then can this have to do with an Article on works *before* Justification,

^k P. 24.

unless persons can be " eminent saints of Christ," " members of Christ," and yet never have been justified? Or is it not then true, that of persons who have been justified freely by God, and by Baptism made members of His Son, some are capable of larger communications of His merits and the influence of His Passion than others? And do not means of grace, which He has entrusted us with, which we may use or refuse, make us so? Does not prayer? or are not they, who, like Anna, have spent a life " in fasting and prayer, night and day," capable of larger communications, than others, or than at the outset they were? What means it, that we " receive grace for grace," but that we receive one degree of grace for, or upon, another, according to our use of His former gifts? or " he that hath, to him shall be given," than that by having, and using, we obtain larger and fuller gifts? what the parable of the talents, than that God condescends to give us His gifts to trade with, and make increase of, and return to Him (it is He who so speaks) " with usury," and which He will reward? And what is His reward, but Himself? He first gives to us, who were and had nothing; He enables us to use, and by using to enlarge, His gifts; He gives them not to us as a lifeless mass, but bedews us with His living Spirit, Wherein our spirit is to grow and make increase: He, who gave His Son for us, giveth us Himself, enlarges the mansions of our souls by Himself, enableth us to enlarge them, and enlarged fills them with Himself.

It is a meagre and suspicious theology,—suspicious, because ignorant of the ground whereon it stands, and the bounds laid down for it, and so fearful lest itself or others should be overstepping them unconsciously,—which would ever bring men back to first principles, confounds the superstructure with the foundation, and forbids men from " going on unto perfection." It forbids our using the rich treasures

of Holy Scripture, taking to the letter what it saith, glorying in the large and manifold gifts of our Father, unless at every step we be careful to repeat what it regards as the central doctrine, or *shew* that we are consistent with it. It would have us never fix our eye upon any one truth intently, unless such as itself chooses, for fear we should lose sight of others; it would make us concentrate and condense and congeal the wide expanse of revealed Truth; or have us walk as in an enemy's country, guarded on all points, and looking suspiciously around, instead of walking freely, as Isaac, "in the eventide to meditate," or in our new-created Paradise, "in the cool of the day," to hear unalarmed the voice of our now reconciled God.

Yet this heavy and burthensome theology is not of the character of Holy Scripture. Scripture teaches us not, by its example, to speak thus fearfully and perplexedly. It speaks unhesitatingly of Abraham's being "justified by works," without stopping to insert any clause which might save this doctrine from seeming to impugn that of justification by faith. It says, "Alexander the coppersmith did *me* much evil; the Lord reward him according to his works," (2 Tim. iv. 14.) without staying to shew how this is consistent with the Lord's command, "Bless your enemies." It says, "by hope we are saved," (Rom. viii. 24.) "by His life shall we be saved," (Rom. v. 10.) "by the Gospel ye are saved," (1 Cor. xv. 2.) "by grace ye are saved," (Eph. ii. 5. 8.) "by the washing of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Ghost He saved us," (Tit. iii. 5.) "in doing this *thou shalt save thyself*," (1 Tim. iv. 16.) "the word—is able to save your souls," (Jam. i. 21.) "when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness which he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive," (Ezek. xviii. 27.) without subjoining on each occasion every other limitation,

which in other places it furnishes; nor does it turn aside to guard its statement, lest it be thought to imply, that man can save his own soul. Again it says, "if by any means—I might save some of them," (Rom. xii. 14.) "how knowest thou whether thou shalt save thy husband?" (1 Cor. vii. 16.) "the prayer of faith shall save the sick," (Jam. v. 15.) "he shall save a soul from death," (ib. 20.) "others save with fear," (Jude 23.) without inserting one word to shew that prayer doth not save by its intrinsic efficacy, or that man cannot, of himself, save his brother. And though uninspired writers may not, of course, in expressing their own thoughts, use the same unguardedness as the Divine word, yet surely the timid spirit, which would ever be qualifying and guarding what Holy Scripture has left unqualified and unguarded, and suspects whatever, after the manner of Scripture, is left unqualified, betokens a weak faith, not in the individual, but in the age of which it is a characteristic, and is in the way to lose all fuller exhibitions of Divine truth. God hath put His Spirit into the Christian Church, within us; and "whithersoever the Spirit was to go, thither is our spirit to go," (Ezek. i. 20.) with the full freedom of those, into whose hearts and mouths God has put His thoughts and words, not abridging our liberty, or curtailing or qualifying His message, because they, who will, must "daily mistake our words."

This is said, not on account of the particular occasion, (for in this the words *were* guarded by the very subject itself,) but as a protest against the suspicious, captious spirit, which measures every thing, whether the language and thoughts of the fathers of the Church, or of those who would tread in their steps, by its own petty rule, instead of the capacious measure of the word of God.

Feast of the Epiphany,
1838.



APPENDIX II.

On the Revolution of 1688, and the principles involved or not involved in its condemnation, in reply to an article in the Edinburgh Review.

AFTER the above remarks were in type, a fuller and more mature discussion of one principle of the Sermon appeared, written also in a calm tone very different from that which has usually characterized the periodical^a in which it occurs.

The writer very honestly casts aside all "foolish sneers^b," clears the deck of every thing superfluous, casts overboard all the unfair weapons which have at times been used, and grapples at once with the question, in a way which evinces honesty, and thus far deserves respect. He moreover,

^a Edinburgh Review, Jan. 1838.

^b p. 390. Heathenish language, such as "both agreeing in letting off an occasional volley at Guy Fawkes, whose shade must have been surprised and gratified at the participation of such eminent associates in his annual martyrdom," p. 396. and "the doctrines of Divine right and passive obedience were in favour it should seem, under Nebuchadnezzar and Darius the Mede," p. 399. is more in keeping, one should hope, with the work wherein it appears, than with the mind of the writer, in whom there are many gleams of earnestness. Surely men ought not to familiarize themselves to speak in jest, as if they were Heathen; and without anticipating the sentence of his Judge, they should recollect that Fawkes is alive still, though not in the flesh, and awaiting that sentence. Again, they are God's commands to obey Nebuchadnezzar and Darius, which are thus irreverently alluded to. There is other language, p. 410, which a serious man should not have used.

not concedes only, but insists that "the doctrine of non-resistance to established authority is most strikingly declared in Scripture, from the total absence of all qualification and adaptation to the weak faith and cherished prejudices of the natural man," and declares "the endeavour to evade or explain it away, and find shelter under it for those heathen notions of manliness and nobleness of character, of which we are so loath to divest ourselves," to be altogether vain^c. This is healthful language, and we trust it may be a sign of an improved tone of feeling, that such and some kindred sentiments have found their way into a publication which used to be the organ of others far different.

The writer further says, "Every human commission is, therefore, ratified by the divine precept of obedience to it, and 'every power that is,' *however derived*, is 'ordained of God,'" and that "it is no doubt true, that it will not become the Christian to make captious objections, eagerly to seek for and avail himself of flaws in title or defects in forms^d;" that "the doctrine of non-resistance is at least one which no sincere believer will endeavour to controvert or evade^e." Herewith then, the general principle is maintained in as ample a manner as could be wished; and were these the abiding sentiments of our educated and half-educated classes, it might seem a secondary question how the act of 1688 were to be judged of according to these principles, whether it was condemned by them or escaped them. But these are not the principles popularly inculcated, or rather they are principles which would ordinarily be scoffed at; and one act, as it embodies principles and presents them in a tangible form, and lays bare often to people themselves what they really mean under them, and moreover is taking an overt part,

^c p. 400.

^d p. 401.

^e p. 397.

either with God's Law or against it, will, in practical influence, far outweigh any abstract principles. It is proverbial too, how acts are stretched into precedents beyond themselves; passion and excitement are no honest pleaders; the principles of an act are forgotten; it suffices that it seem any how to bear upon the present state of things, or can be but fancied into a resemblance to them. As long then as the revolution of 1688 is panegyricized, so long there will be great danger, that it will be drawn into a precedent for acts very different in degree of guilt from itself. "Invasion of civil liberty," "English rights," are terms which are just as applicable, and in these days far more easily applied, to any question which the popular voice may demand, than to those which furnished the occasion for the Revolution of 1688. A revolution would in these days come, not from any aggression on the part of the Sovereign, but (which God avert!) from the resistance to aggression on the part of a section of the people. It would have the character of the first rebellion, not of the second. The fact that a king has been deposed, and another murdered, remains in men's minds; one they have happily been taught to look upon with detestation, the other, unhappily, they have been taught to admire; and such admiration has the tendency to bring with it the penalty of all approbation of unlawful deeds, a confusion of men's perception of right and wrong, and so to produce "*progeniem vitiosorem.*"

Each important act, moreover, has a necessary progeny of its own; which it will bring into being against the will often of its own parents. It gives a new direction to people's minds; the principles which lay variously interwoven with it, are developed, and those which were most marked and predominant in it, stamp their image upon its posterity; the rest are gradually effaced. The main

principles involved in the act of 1688, were that a nation under certain circumstances has a right to dethrone its monarch, that power emanates from the people^f, that its will is to be received as law; that the king is the “*chief*” of the English Commonwealth” only; that government is in such sense appointed for the benefit of the ruled, that they, not the ruler, are to be the judges, what is for their benefit. The sovereign has ceased, in fact and practically, to be even a “coordinate part of the legislative,” except so far as from personal character, or a sort of unconscious respect, or having the means of more refined bribery, he may influence the legislators; it is a government of influence not of authority, and yearly becoming more circumscribed. The refusal of the sovereign to assent to an alteration in the laws which had received the sanction of the two Houses^h, would probably excite more sensation now, than the dis-

^f “It could not be held, without breaking up all the foundations of our polity, that the monarchy emanated from the parliament, or even from the people. But by the revolution and by the act of settlement, the rights of the actual monarch, of the reigning family, were made to emanate from the parliament and the people. In technical language, in the grave and respectful theory of our Constitution, the Crown is still the fountain from which law and justice spring forth. Its prerogatives are in the main the same as under the Tudors and the Stuarts; but the right of the House of Brunswick to exercise them can only be deduced from the Convention of 1688. The great advantage therefore of the revolution, as I would explicitly affirm, consists in that which was reckoned its reproach by many, and its misfortune by more; that it broke the line of succession.” Hallam, t. iii. p. 126, 7.

^g Hallam Const. Hist. c. 15.

^h It should not be forgotten that a popular (the long) parliament once chose to construe the words of the then coronation oath, “*leges et consuetudines quas vulgus elegerit*,” contrary to their plain meaning and the authority of the English form of the oath, “the laws, which the people *shall* choose,” and thence to insist that the sovereign was bound to accept any laws proposed to him by the two Houses. What was then looked on as an insolent and wanton assumption of power, would now be taken almost as a matter of course.

pensation with existing laws did in the time of James II. Panegyrist of the act of 1688, are wont to call it the "birth of English liberty," and the like; the very terms, which they use, imply that it has grown since. "The revolution," says Hume obviously enough, "forms a new epoch in the constitution. By deciding many important questions in favour of liberty, and still more *by that great precedent of deposing one king*, and establishing a new family, it gave such an ascendant to popular principles, as has put the nature of the English constitution beyond all controversy. And it may justly be affirmed, without any danger of exaggeration, that we in this island have ever since enjoyed, if not *the best system of government, at least the most entire system of liberty* that ever was known amongst mankind." Only Hume lived not long enough to see "the ascendancy then given to popular principles," developed as they have been in our days into what seems ready to become the most fearful of all tyrannies. And if they are yet to be turned aside from holding on their natural course into some fresh and more fearful anarchy, it must be, not by opposing them in detail, but by reviewing our own principles. It is idle to contend against the building up of the superstructure which others are raising on our foundation, so long as we are continually strengthening that foundation, and preparing it to bear a more perilous and prouder pile of building. Chiefly, however, it is a primary duty (nationally as individually) to Almighty God, to confess our offences committed against Him; and it has been annexed by Him, as the condition of those offences being blotted out; it opens the hope also that we humbling ourselves before Him, the evil which is their appointed portion may not be brought upon us.

It is then of much moment, as was said, to review the character of the act of 1688, (which by thoughtlessly

panegyrising, many of us have made ourselves sharers in,) even beyond the question of the principles at stake.

By the writer in question it is justified on the following principles^h, that all authorities, a parish constable as well as a king, are “ powers ordained of God,” that it is “ just as plainly a sin to oppose” the one as the other, and so that the converse would be true, that if you may in any case of “ unprovoked violence, to life, person, or property, grossly exceeding the limits of the power which the state allots him,” resist the constable, you may the king. “ By the common understanding of the constitution, James’s subjects were no more bound to obey the legislation of the monarch, than the legislation of the constable.”

All this might be conceded, and not one step gained towards justifying the act of 1688. For there is an obvious and wide difference between resisting even the constable in such a case, and on one’s own authority expelling him the village, or degrading him from his office. Our good bishops refused “ to obey” against their consciences, “ the legislation of James;” but they “ owedⁱ to his Majesty a natural allegiance, having been born in his kingdom, had oftentimes confirmed this by taking voluntarily the oaths of supremacy and allegiance, and could have at once but one king;” and so they suffered alike under James and William, because at the command neither of James nor William would they do that which was illegal, and contrary to conscience; they would neither read the declaration which was contrary to the law of man, nor take an oath contrary to the law of God, and yet under both James and William they lived as peaceable subjects. To

^h Edinb. Rev. p. 401, 2.

ⁱ Abp. Sancroft’s Answer to King James, on being asked whether the bishops had joined in inviting William. ap. Clarendon, App. p. 310.

disobey a king who commands what is unlawful, and to dethrone him, are very different acts, and the ground which fully justifies the one, has no bearing upon the other; so also again there is a wide difference between the supposed extreme acts of the constable, and those of James. There is nothing which can in any way be described as “unprovoked violence to life, person, or property, grossly exceeding the limits of the powers,” analogous to the case of the constable.

“The glorious Revolution,” (says a writer^f, whose language betrays the vehemence of his liberalism, and which one is almost ashamed of quoting,) “cannot be defended without rejecting the slavish principles of absolute obedience, or even that pretended modification of them, which imagines some extreme case of intolerable tyranny, some, as it were, lunacy of despotism, as the only plea and palliation of resistance. Doubtless he was not a Caligula, or a Commodus, or a Ezzelin, or a Galeazzo Sforza, or a Christiern II. of Denmark, or a Charles IX. of France, or one of those almost innumerable tyrants whom men have endured in the wantonness of unlimited power. No man had been deprived of his liberty by any illegal warrant. No man, except in the single though very important instance of Magdalen College, had been despoiled of his property. I must also add, that the government of James II. will lose little by comparison with that of his father. The judgment in favour of his prerogative to dispense with the test, was far more according to received notions of law, far less injurious and unconstitutional, than that which gave a sanction to ship money. The injunction to read the declaration of indulgence in churches was less offensive to scrupulous men, than the similar command to read the declaration of Sunday sports in the time of Charles I. Nor was any one punished for a refusal to comply with the one, while the prisons had been filled with those who had disobeyed the other. Nay, what is more, there are much stronger presumptions of the father’s than of the son’s intention to lay aside parliaments, and set up an avowed despotism. It is indeed amusing to

^f Hallam, t. iii. p. 113—15.

observe that many, who scarcely put bounds to their eulogies of Charles I. have been content to abandon the cause of one, who had no faults in his public conduct but such as seem to have come by inheritance.

Herewith, by this writer at least, all the ground upon which the revolution was of old¹ defended, is abandoned. It is well however to review the illegal acts of King James II, not as his apologist, but that we may have before us those facts, which were thought strong enough to make rebellion justifiable, or lawful, or glorious. This is the more important, because persons have vulgarly taken up some vague notions of the arbitrary proceedings of James II, and in ignorance of the real facts, of the extent of the real evil, and of the possibility of remedy and of the relative circumstances, they have assumed as an axiom that the case was in itself extreme, and that there was no other remedy.

“It is no wonder,” says even one² of the defenders of the Revolution, “that these events have long, by the representations of faction, been extremely clouded and obscured. No man has yet arisen, who has paid an entire regard to truth, and has dared to expose her, without covering or disguise, to the eyes of the prejudiced public. Even that party amongst us which boasts of the highest regard to liberty, has not possessed sufficient liberty of thought in this particular, nor has been able to decide impartially of their own merit, compared with that of their antagonists. The Whig party, for a course of near seventy years, has, almost without interruption, enjoyed the whole authority of government; and no honours or offices could be obtained but by their countenance and protection. But this event, which, in some particulars, has been advantageous to the State, has proved destructive to the truth of history, and has established many gross falsehoods, which it is unaccountable how any civilized nation could have embraced with regard to its domestic occurrences.

See “Appeal from the new to the old Whigs,” exhibiting the principles maintained by the Whigs, in the impeachment of Dr. Sacheverel, in extracts from their speeches. *Burke's Works*, t. vi. p.145—81.

² Hume, *Hist.* c. 71.

The illegal acts were: 1st and chiefly, that "James^b assumed the power of legislation, for to dispense with existing laws was to legislate; his subjects resisted," and this writer rests the lawfulness of the revolution on this fact only. Yet the ultra-liberal writer just quoted, says¹:

The Kings of England, if not immemorially, yet from a very early æra in our records, had exercised a prerogative unquestioned by parliament, and recognised by courts of justice, that of granting dispensations from the prohibitions and penalties of particular laws. The language of ancient Statutes was usually brief and careless, with few of those attempts to regulate prospective contingencies, which, even with our pretended modern caution, are so often imperfect; and, as the Sessions were never regular, sometimes interrupted for several years, there was a kind of necessity, or great convenience, in deviating occasionally from the rigour of a general prohibition; more often, perhaps, some motive of interest or partiality would induce the crown to infringe on the legal rule. This dispensing power, however, grew up, as it were, collaterally to the sovereignty of the legislature, which it sometimes appeared to overshadow. It was of course asserted in large terms by counsellors of state, and too frequently by the interpreters of law. Lord Coke, before he had learnt the bolder tone of his declining years, lays it down, that no act of Parliament can bind the King from any prerogative which is inseparable from his person, so that he may not dispense with it by a non-obstante; such is his sovereign power to command any of his subjects to serve him for the public weal, which solely and inseparably is annexed to his person, and cannot be restrained by an Act of Parliament. Thus, although the statute 23 H. VI. c. 8, provides that all patents to hold the office of sheriff for more than one year shall be void, and even enacts that the king shall not dispense with it; yet it was held by all the judges in the reign of Henry VII., that the King may grant such a patent for a longer term on good grounds, whereof he alone is the judge. So also the statutes which restrain the King from granting pardons in case of murder

^b Edinb. Rev. p. 402.

¹ Hallam, t. iii. p. 83 sqq.

have been held void; and doubtless the constant practice has been to disregard them.

This high and dangerous prerogative nevertheless was subject to several limitations, which none but the grosser flatterers of monarchy could deny. It was agreed among lawyers that the King could not dispense with the common law, nor with any statute prohibiting that which was *malum in se*, nor with any right or interest of a private person or corporation. The rules, however, were still rather complicated, the boundaries indefinite, and therefore varying according to the political character of the judges.

But the immediate circumstances of the case render it the more striking. In the instance in which it was judicially decided, the chief Justice (Herbert) was an honest and upright man, (as he shewed himself afterwards by his protest in the case of Magd. Coll.) and yet he, and in the whole eleven out of the twelve judges, decided in favour of the validity of the dispensation. The exception is said* to have been a judge of very indifferent reputation.

“It is by no means evident,” continues the same author¹, “that the decision in this particular case of Hales, which had the approbation of eleven judges out of twelve, was against law. The course of precedents seems rather to furnish its justification.”

And yet this case involves the whole question of the dispensing power exercised in this reign. And accordingly this writer goes on to argue the necessity of the revolution, not from the *il*-legality, but from the legality of this dispensing power.

“But the less untenable such a judgment in favour of the dispensing power might appear, the more necessity would men of reflection perceive of making some great change in the relations of the people towards their sovereign. A prerogative of setting aside the enactments of parliament, which in trifling matters, and for the sake of conferring a benefit on individuals, might be suffered to exist with little mischief, became intole-

* Lingard, vii. 106.

¹ Hallam, p. 86, 7.

rable when exercised in contravention of the very principle of those statutes, which had been provided for the security of fundamental liberties or institutions. Thus the Test Act, the great achievement, as it had been reckoned, of the protestant party, for the sake of which the most subservient of parliaments had just then ventured to lose the king's favour, became absolutely nugatory and ineffective, by a construction which the law itself did not reject. Nor was it easy to provide any sufficient remedy by means of parliament; since it was the doctrine of the judges, that the king's inseparable and sovereign prerogatives in matters of government could not be taken away or restrained by statute. The unadvised assertion in a court of justice of this principle, which though not by any means novel, had never been advanced in a business of such universal concern and interest, may be said to have sealed the condemnation of the house of Stuart. It made the co-existence of an hereditary line, claiming a sovereign prerogative paramount to the liberties they had vouchsafed to concede, incompatible with the security or probable duration of those liberties. This incompatibility is the true basis of the revolution in 1688.

In other words, it was pronounced by the authorized interpreters of the law, not as a new doctrine, but in accordance with antient practice, that a certain prerogative belonged to the king, which made the English monarchy not altogether unlimited, (for James's independence of his parliament arose from their having granted him supplies for his life,) but less restricted than suited the will of the then people; and therefore they were to rebel, and the existing line to be cast out, not so much on account of the acts in themselves, but as a necessary preliminary to a supposed better state of things, to make way for a more satisfactory arrangement of "the relations of the people towards their sovereign."

It is remarkable, (as it has been remarked^m), that even the revolutionary Convention, which tendered the crown to

^m Hume, c. 70, p. 249, note.

William of Orange, did not absolutely deny this power of dispensation, but only declared it “ illegal *as* it had been assumed and exercised *of late* ;” so that it may well be supposed, that James thought himself justified in the particular cases, when even this body of men, so committed as they were, did not venture to deny it wholly, or in the abstract.

It is further remarkable, that this right of dispensation was exercised in behalf of that class, whose so-called “ emancipation” was carried some years past, against the known strong repugnance of the Sovereign, through the threat of a civil war, in case of its refusal. It were easy to decide which, although finally settled more in accordance to the *forms* of law, was the most illegal.

2. *The Ecclesiastical Commission.* This was a revival of a Statute of Elizabeth, which was abolished by an act of the Long Parliament (no very acceptable authority), which last “ act again had been repealed by 13 Charles II. c. 12, which, while it put down the High Commission Court, with its *extraordinary* powers of imposing fines, committing to prison, and tendering the oath *ex officio*, preserved to the spiritual courts the exercise of their *ordinary* jurisdiction, and to the Crown that of its *ordinary* supremacy. James consulted the judges, and was by them advised to appoint a standing court of delegates with *ordinary* powers to hear and determine ecclesiastical causes, and to pronounce on offenders ecclesiastical censures ⁿ.” The Commission was doubtless an intrenchment on the authority of the Church, and on that ground probably, the then Metropolitan (San- croft), though appointed to it, never sat upon it. Since, however, two bishops, the Lord Chancellor, Lord Treasurer, the President of the Council, and the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, consented to sit upon it; sanctioned also

ⁿ Lingard. t. vii. p. 109, 10.

as it was by the highest legal authority ; it will scarcely be thought ground for the deposition of a king. Least of all will it probably be argued in these days, that the appointment of an Ecclesiastical Commission with large and undefined and even oppressive powers, is a ground for disloyalty or rebellion.

3. The memorable case of Hough falls under the Ecclesiastical Commission. It was an invasion of rights which now seem undoubted, established to be so perhaps by the passive and suffering resistance of the body thus invaded. And at the time, chief justice Herbert declares^o, "I utterly denied that dispensation to be of any force at all, because there was a particular right and interest vested in the members of that College, as there is in the members of many other corporations, of choosing their own head." Yet the Ecclesiastical Commission (in whole or in part) twice decided against the Fellows of Magdalen ; and it is said by the same liberal historian^p, "Elizabeth would probably have treated the Fellows of any college much in the same manner as James II, if they had proceeded to an election in defiance of her recommendation;" and he rests the tyranny of the act on the change of times ; "the right was not the less clearly theirs, and the struggles of a century would have been thrown away, if James II. was to govern as the Tudors, or even as his father and grandfather had done before him." The act remains the same, a wrongful act ; but the sanction which he then had, must be taken into account in estimating the ulterior measures which it foreboded, or the animus which it indicated. James II. had taken no oath which Elizabeth had not, and what would have been borne in the one, was clearly no sufficient ground for the expulsion of the other.

^o State Trials, xi. 1263, ap. Lingard. p. 154.

^p Hallam, p. 104.

4. The admission of dissenters into corporations, by means of a "motley council of catholics and presbyterians", "the whole effect¹ of which was to place municipal power and trust in the hands of the Non-conformists, those precarious and unfaithful allies of the court." The legislation of James is in many points a remarkable anticipation of the measures of the nineteenth century; may it stop short of the rest and of the result!

Such were the acts alleged as the grounds for the revolt of 1688, and it will hardly be thought by any one dispassionately reviewing the whole, (whatever his abstract views may be,) that they furnished any adequate grounds for the deposition of King James: nor indeed, though in some measure the plea, can they in fact, in any sense be said to have been the *grounds*. They, and very little beside, (or principally the pitiable and disproved pretext of the suppositiousness of the new-born heir apparent,) were mentioned indeed in the declaration published by the Prince of Orange; yet it is confessed on all hands, that not these, but the dread of the establishment of Popery, and of danger to the national religion, were *the* grounds of the Revolution; that is, no past acts, but a dread of future danger, were the grounds of the Rebellion. Of those very acts too, some who were active in promoting this rebellion, had been forward to partake; in Scotland with few exceptions, the proclamation of "liberty of conscience" was accepted by the Presbyterian ministers²; in England, the abolition of the test was received with exultation³ by the Anabaptists, Quakers, Independents, Presbyterians as well as Romanists; and the Protestant

¹ Innes' life of James, ap. Hallam, p. 102.

² Hallam, p. 103.

³ Lingard, p. 128, 9.

⁴ See Authorities ap. Lingard, p. 145.

dissenters, chiefly, availed themselves of it¹: some even preached in favour of it². “The benchers and barristers of the middle Temple” and, as we are told³, “every description of persons, the clergy, non-conformists of all denominations, grand juries, justices of peace, corporations, inhabitants of towns, sent up addresses to the number of some hundreds, in consequence of the declaration,” which is now to furnish an adequate ground for the king’s expulsion; and of these “the clergy only limited their thanks⁴ to some promises of favour to the established Church.”

On the other hand, the acquittal of the seven Bishops, and the fair choice of the jury, shewed that, however James might deem himself entitled to remove judges at his will, the fountain of justice was not poisoned: the acclamations, with which the acquittal was received by the army; the affecting devotion of the people to the Bishops on their way to the tower, and to their trial; and the manner⁵ in which the army had received the King’s appeal to

¹ “Surely without reproach,” observes Mr. Hallam, (p. 103.) The remark seems to imply that his conscience revolted at his apology for those who availed themselves of an illegal act, and then made the illegality whereby they profited a pretext for rebellion.

² Pease and Barclay at Chester, Barillon ap. Lingard, p. 161.

³ Hallam, p. 100.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Hume, c. 71. This has been strangely overlooked by Mr. Hallam, p. 117, where he mentions the “numerous army” as one of the pleas for the necessity of the Revolution. He says also, “above all, he would at the last have recourse to France;” this is wholly gratuitous; James had shewn no inclination to have any resort to the “hazardous” and unprincipled “experiment of bringing over French troops:” when his subjects were in rebellion against him, and had brought over foreign troops, he disclaimed it; and there is no reason to doubt him. Yet on such grounds alone Mr. H. contends that “at least the renewal of civil bloodshed, and the anarchy of rebellion, seemed to be the alternative of slavery, if William had never earned the just title of our

them, whether they would approve of the repeal of the test and papal statutes, shewed that the nation had nothing to fear. The very invitation^a to the Prince of Orange from the association admits that "the army would be very much divided among themselves, many of the officers being discontented, and very many of the common soldiers do daily shew such an aversion of popery;—and among the seamen it is almost certain that not one in ten would do them any service in such a war." With an army, which, on the points whence danger was apprehended, sided against him, how should the king be able, if he wished it, to force a religion upon his people? Nor had he, as yet, ventured upon any *system*, which should evince any such purpose; he had indeed forced upon the University of Oxford two Romanist heads of Colleges, (in one case the patronage having been confided to the Crown,) but the opposition which he had met with in the case of Magdalene College, and the sympathy which that opposition had excited, made it not probable that he would have essayed further steps, or had he essayed, would have been successful, or been able to corrupt the Church through her heads or the guardians of her faith.

Further, two eminent statesmen of the day declined joining the conspiracy to invite the Prince of Orange, on the ground of the *absence of any necessity*. "Halifax^b all

deliverer." *After* William invaded the country, anarchy may have been the alternative of his being king; before, no danger has yet been shewn.

^a See it in Dalrymple, App. p. 229.

^b Dalrymple passim. ap. Hallam, p. 111. See his Letters, Dalr. p. 186, 196, 208, 209, 235, and this so late as July 25, 1688. In a former letter, he says expressly, "all men are settled in their dislike of the unwelcome thing, that is endeavoured to be imposed on them; this consideration alone freeth me in a great measure from the fears I might otherwise have," p. 208. as of the trial of the Bishops, he says, "It is

along discouraged the invasion, pointing out that *the king made no progress in his schemes.*" Nottingham^c excused himself from signing, pleading scruples of conscience, because he "apprehended no ill consequences to religion or the *just* interests of his highness [the Prince of Orange] which a little time would not effectually remedy, nor could he imagine that the papists were able to make any further considerable progress." Lord Shrewsbury^d, and Mr. Sidney^e, (two of the seven conspirators,) both conveyed the same impression to the Prince, as at an earlier date did Lord Mordaunt^f.

Moreover, it is admitted on all hands, that but for the birth of James's son the revolution might never have taken place.

"It was evidently the becoming father of that child," admits the same writer^g, "which rendered his other offences inexpiable. He was now considerably advanced in life; and the decided resistance of his subjects made it improbable that he could do much essential injury to the established constitution during the remainder of it. The mere certainty of all reverting to a protestant heir would be an effectual guarantee of the Angli-

one of those faults that can never be repaired; all that can be done to mend it, will probably make it worse." p. 235.

^c Dalrymple, 232, 237. ap. Lingard, l. c. "It is evidently true that James had made very little progress, or rather experienced a signal defeat, in his endeavour to place the professors of his own religion on a firm and honourable basis." Hallam, p. 116.

^d Dalrymple, p. 214.

^e p. 231.

^f p. 202.

^g Hallam, p. 112. Comp. Lingard, p. 211. "That birth proved the immediate occasion of his downfall." Barillon, the French Ambassador, writes, "The birth of the Prince of Wales may cause a considerable change, and strengthen the Monarchical side. But the factious think it the more necessary to oppose the designs of H. B. M. and that may hasten the execution of what they wish to undertake." June 21, 1688, *ib.*

can church. But the birth of a son to be nursed in the obnoxious bigotry of Rome, the prospect of a regency under the queen, so deeply implicated, according to common report, in the schemes of this reign, made every danger appear more terrible."

Thus then it is admitted by those who admit the validity of such necessity, that there was no visible, no overwhelming, present, necessity, for calling in the Prince of Orange; a little patience, and the "tyranny had been overpast;" whatever is said of breaking "social compacts," and the like, were and are but ingenious theories for justifying in men's own eyes what has taken place, not the grounds upon which it did take place; it was brought about, as its visible causes, partly by interested individuals and manifest traitors, who received from William the payment of their treason, partly by an undefined, mistrusting, faithless apprehension of the future, in no degree justified by the past, partly by the able, but unconscientious, game played by William^h; it was brought about by Him, who guides all

^h It is a singular instance of the early interference of the Prince of Orange in English affairs, that he was cognizant of all the severities of Judge Jeffries, which brought so much odium on James. So, at least, Jeffries stated to Mr. (afterwards Archbishop) Sharp, when he had nothing to gain, and was dying in the Tower, whither he had been, at his own request, removed for safety; "he had done nothing in that affair without the advice and concurrence of—— who now is the darling of the people." (Life of Abp. Sharp, t. i. p. 97.) This application for his "concurrence" in the execution of Monmouth's followers, would even go towards establishing what "was often asserted," (Hallam, iii. 92.) that he "had a share in prompting the invasion of Monmouth" himself. This or the like conversation perhaps gave rise to the report, (Lingard, t. viii. p. 77.) that James was cognizant of the whole. It was safer to fix the odium on James. Or both may be true. The evidence of William's interference, however, does not rest on this; the early correspondence of English politicians with him is one of the most disgraceful parts of our history, and Dalrymple says, that "there are few great families in this country, who will not find that their ancestors (of whatever party they were) had a hand in it in one way or other." App. p. 180.

things, partly, we may hope, in mercy to our Church, in that He allowed us not to plunge into worse extremes, but also in its evil consequences, as a warning to us, how we take first wrong steps. The debates in the House of Lords¹ shew, that a great part of the nation were not prepared to make William king; and had not William terrified James into flight, encouraging the terrors infused by the memory of his father's murder, he probably had never himself been made king. William was made king, without the will and against the intention of the nation at large, because they had entangled themselves in a web of their own weaving, and he held the cord which confined it, drew it round, and inclosed them, and would not let them escape any other way.

“It was urged,” says Burnet^k, “that if, upon any pretence whatsoever the nation might throw off their king, then the Crown must become precarious, and the power of

¹ Several peers who joined in inviting the Prince of Orange, said they would not have done so, had they foreseen the issue. The Bishops, whom James urged to sign a declaration, expressing that they had no share in inviting over the Prince of Orange, and signifying their “dislike or abhorrence or detestation of his proceedings,” seem to have been suspicious of the use, which James would have made of it, and not to have believed that the Prince was really coming. Neither did they like to be associated with the Bishops of Chester (Cartwright) and St. David's. There is no ground to suspect them of temporizing, or wishing to make use of William, as did some temporal peers. Much then as one must lament their refusal, one has no right to blame them. They were also separated from most of their brethren, who had gone to their dioceses. (See the Account in Clarendon, 307, 312—23.) They had also been accused falsely in the declaration of William (for Compton, Bp. of London, alone had joined the conspiracy); and they might think, that since the like self-exculpation was not required of the temporal peers, James meant to use their declaration as a proof that the Bishops approved of his measures. His great earnestness shews how much value he attached to such a document.

^k Own Times, v. fin.

judging the king must be in the people. This must end in a commonwealth. A great deal was brought from both the laws and history of England to prove that not only the person but the authority of the king was sacred.—They did not deny but that great objections lay against the methods that they proposed [a regency, as if the king were personally incapable of governing.] But affairs were brought into so desperate a state by King James's conduct, that it was not possible to propose a remedy, which might not be justly excepted to. But they thought *their expedient would take in the greatest*, as well as the best part of the nation, whereas all other expedients gratified a republican party, composed of the dissenters and of men of no religion, who hoped now to see the Church ruined, and the government set upon such a bottom, as that we should have only a titular king, who, as he had his power from the people, so should be accountable to them for the exercise of it, and should forfeit it at their pleasure. The much greater part of the House of Lords was for this, and so was about a third part of the House of Commons. The greatest part of the Clergy declared themselves for it."

This feeling seems even to have increased as time went on; "there was an ill-humour," drops Burnet incidentally, "*already spreading itself through the nation*, and through the Clergy," i. e. persons were already recovering from the surprise in which they had been plunged, beginning to see that they had entered upon a more perilous course than they were aware, doubtful about its issue, and discontented with its authors. And this probably determined William at last to break silence, and by declining the regency, or any thing short of the crown, to open people's eyes, and shew them that they had no alternative, but that of accepting his terms, or recalling James: for whom could they make Regent? The vote of the Commons mem-

bers of the Convention, declaring the throne vacant, was rejected by eleven in the Lords; “but it was impossible,” says Hume, “for the public to remain long in the present situation. The perseverance therefore of the lower house [of Convention] obliged the Lords to give way.” To this may be added, that the House of Lords, then as on most cases of excitement, probably most truly represented the permanent sentiments of the people; the lower house of Convention, moreover, was put together, by chance, from surviving members of the Parliament of Charles II, and the Mayor, Aldermen, and fifty of the Common Council, which, towards the close of Charles II. reign, “was¹ entirely in the hands of the malcontents,” and whose temper was not likely to have been improved by the forfeiture of their charter, even though taken from them under Charles by law, and restored to them when, just before the invasion, James redressed all grievances. So little ground is there then for all boast about the Revolution of 1688, which was finally carried, because those who wished to make a tool of William, were taken in their own craftiness by one craftier than they.

Thus far then, it appears, I think, that the alleged justification of the act of 1688 fails, 1. because it was not on those principles that it, in fact, proceeded; but from an unreasonable panic on the part of the nation and treachery in individuals. 2. Because no case can be made out of such magnitude as to justify the application of those principles, even supposing those principles to be true. 3. The farthest to which these principles would in any case go would be a passive resistance, a refusal to obey the king against the laws, (as did our seven Bishops,) not aggression upon him or his expulsion.

¹ Hume, c. 59.

The writer in question remarkably confuses these two last points, resistance and aggression, and on that confusion rests his argument; he says^m:

The members of that council [the Convention] met in fear and uncertainty; they, too, were determined on resistance, but it was long ere they decided on its consequences; and at last, whether through their fear of anarchy, or their passions, or their interests, the hand of Providence brought William to the throne, and the great change ended in the dethronement of a king and subversion of a dynasty. With the justification of each particular step in the change—of the forced abdication—of the assembling of the informal convention, and so forth—whether each was just, or expedient, or religious—we have nothing here to do. Nor are we at all concerned with the characters and motives of the actors in that revolution.—The only important question of conscience is, as Dr. Pusey will agree with us, whether James's subjects had a right to resist him; a question involving the right of resistance to usurped authority in all generations.

But the question as here put, is ambiguous, and that upon which it turns, is glossed over; the question is not simply whether James's subjects had a right to *resist* him; but if this be granted, *what sort of resistance* they had a right to offer, refusal simply to concur in single unlawful acts, and to execute unlawful commands, or violence to his person and majesty—whether they had a right to *expel* him, or to offer that sort of resistance which would end in his expulsion. The points, with which it is said that we have nothing to do, are every thing in this question, or rather chiefly that one, which our homilies so remarkably condemn, and in which all the rest are involved, the calling in a foreign power, not simply as a mediator, but as an invader, with an armed force, against their own sovereign. It may be, after this, there was no retreat; and

^m Edinb. Rev. p. 403.

those who invited the invader must have been involved in a civil war. Englishmen against Englishmen, and made our country the theatre of foreign war, the French against the Dutch, had James thought right to use the same means to defend his throne, as some of his subjects did to overthrow it; but this only further illustrates the evil of the first measure. If, as some moderns have contended^a, every step was linked to the former, so that after William's landing there was no alternative, if James's recall of his obnoxious measures was too late, and there was no "locus pœnitentiæ" for a king, then clearly we are to view the first action in the full concentrated light of all which succeeded it, not glide smoothly over them, as if they were involuntary. So it is with the latter stages of most sin; it is at least in this sense, involuntary; they who perpetrate it, feel compunction at it, hesitate, shrink from it, but do it; because they have "sold themselves to do wickedness" by their first act, and they are no longer their own masters, but slaves.

The excuse "they were determined on resistance,—and at last the hand of Providence brought William to the throne," somewhat resembles that offered by a saint of God, in the one unrighteous action, to which he was led by compromising with a rebellious people; "They gave me the gold; then I cast it into the fire; and there came out this calf." But the excuse availed him not; "The Lord," said Moses to the people, "was very angry with Aaron to have destroyed him^b."

Nor can it be conceded that the motives and characters of the actors in this Revolution are to be passed over, as irrelevant; certainly not by one who would justify that act. For if there was (as there indeed was) a miserable duplicity, and self-interest, and private revenge, in many of the

^a Hallam, p. 117, 118. ^o Exodus xxxii. 24. ^p Deut. ix. 19.

contrivers of that act, this, in itself, goes far to stamp the act itself, and to afford a presumption, that they involved the nation in it without reference to principle or Christian duty. Again, the falsehoods employed, both as to the supposititiousness of the Prince of Wales, and the objects of the Prince of Orange's coming, belong not to a righteous cause. They who acted from private motives were traitors, and this is but an ill element towards a "glorious," or if it did not at once sound as a contradiction, a Christian revolution.

And so, even waving for a time the peremptory duty of submission to authority, it will appear from the precipitancy of the act, how very far from a Christian act this was. What patience had been shewn? what forbearance? what endeavour to remonstrate with the king? what intervening step between flattery and rebellion? what fulfilment of the law, "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault?" Rather, the king had been inveigled to the brink of the precipice; in 1687, in¹ "his progress from London to Bath and thence to Chester, he was received with acclamations;" "the king," says the observant French ambassador, "believes that his journey has served to bring back men's minds to him, and that the people have been undeceived as to many falsehoods;" "the singular contrast between the addresses, sent up to him in that year (1687,) and what we know of the prevailing disposition of the people in that year, and of their general abandonment of the King's cause before the end of the

¹ Lingard, p. 161.

^r Barillon, *ib.* p. 163. Two letters of King James to the Prince of Orange, April and May, 1687, express, he "finds his Declaration contributes much to things being so quiet, the generality of the nation being satisfied with it, and at ease by it." *ap.* Dalrymple, *App.* p. 182, 3.

next" has been noticed by an Apologist⁴ of the revolution, so that he says "we should have cause to blush for the servile hypocrisy of our ancestors, if there were not good reason to believe that these addresses were *sometimes* the work of a small minority in the name of the rest." This, if true, would so far excuse some members of a class; it does not excuse the nation; the University of Oxford, which was aggrieved, openly avowed herself aggrieved, and for so doing she was (and with her, the Church) taunted¹ for inconsistency and "apostasy from their professions:" of the King's other acts the Clergy alone² conveyed their disapprobation. And this then we are to suppose such intolerable servitude, that it required the desperate remedy of calling in an invader, and rebelling against the lawful sovereign! Truly it is more like the act of an assassin, who with fair speeches should lead on a person to the ambush set for his life, than that of a Christian people. Be it that in the case of the seven Bishops, James shewed himself little inclined to yield even to respectful remonstrance, yet by them he had been disobeyed; they had declared the measure of the sovereign illegal; and so he thought himself aggrieved: but what if others had done like them? what, had the people remonstrated instead of flattering? James issued orders³ indeed "to prosecute all those clergymen, who had not read his declaration i. e. the whole church of England, 200 excepted;" but such resolves betray passion only, and can never issue in any result except the disgrace and defeat of him who engages in them; a whole people has always the means of self-redress against the permanent pressure of things unjust, by abstaining tranquilly from complying with them; or if there be risk in some cases to individuals—and

⁴ Hallam, p. 100.

¹ Id. p. 107 and note.

² Id. p. 100.

³ Hume, c. 70.

every thing valuable is to be purchased by the sufferings of the few, who are called to the more prominent posts,—what was this to be accounted of? In this case, it appeared too, from the result of the trial of the Bishops, that a little temporary inconvenience alone was the result; and, after their trial, James, although he used angry words, tried the issue no further. Poor and mean then were the attainments of Christian patience and endurance, were such as these its legitimate bounds! When, moreover, King James saw that his people did in earnest desire an alteration in his line of conduct, he altered it; the first intimation he received that it was displeasing to his subjects was the notice that the armaments of William were intended against him, and that William had been invited by some of his own subjects; but above a month before the Prince of Orange landed, he had begun to revoke the obnoxious measures; and before he sailed, every thing was restored to its former footing, every trace of misrule effaced⁷; and his acts, for they were not mere promises, were accepted “with the usual demonstrations of public joy².” “It was pity,” said Lord Clarendon shortly before to the Princess his daughter and ultimate successor³, “that nobody would take this opportunity of speaking freely and honestly to the King;” but it was a readier way to betray him.

Such then having been the case, the rebellion of 1688 is, obviously, wholly unjustifiable on the most ordinary principles of Christian morality, without having recourse to any of the higher doctrines of non-resistance, or the more difficult trials of Christian principle. And in the rest of the subject we may lay aside all reference to that

⁷ See Clarendon's Diary and authorities ap. Lingard, p. 227.

² *Ib.* p. 228.

³ *Diary*, p. 68.

event, and speak of the principle only, in order to clear our own views of Christian obedience in itself.

The resistance to the supreme authority of a state, has been defended by a sort of common-sense-appeal, "you would in such or such a case surely resist a constable, and since his authority is also from God, if you may resist the lowest, you may also the highest." Bearing in mind the fallacy above stated^c, and that resisting a constable and ejecting a constable, resisting a king or not complying with unlawful commands, and deposing a king, are not one and the same thing, there are yet other points in which this supposed analogy between the highest and lowest authority fails.

1. It is obvious that the ground of resisting the constable, in any such extreme case as is supposed, lies in the *instant* necessity of the case. When violence is offered to life, if the authority be not resisted *then*, it is too late. There is a fallacy in selecting the instance out of just that class, in which physical force is necessarily employed. The analogy would not have held of a judge. Nor had any life been threatened or endangered by the measures of King James. 2. The lowest authority does not derive his power *directly* from God, but mediately through other authorities. We have then interpreters of the authority given to him; his authority is limited by the higher human authority, which delegated it; so that in resisting him, when violating his authority, we are executing the authority which the same source of authority has given to us. We are acting in obedience to the higher authority in resisting the lower. The king we are bid to obey "as supreme^d," i. e. not deriving his authority from any earthly power, but directly from God, and being the channel through which

^b Edinb. Rev. p. 401.

^c p. 80, 1.

^d 1 Pet. ii. 13.

power is conveyed to inferior authorities. 3. There is no danger of any ulterior confusion in resisting the lower authority; we do it, at our own responsibility, but as being answerable to a higher human authority for our actions. No further evil can result beyond that involved in any resistance whatever. But a nation, or as it always is, part of a nation, when it rebels, risks bringing the most hideous miseries and brutalities on those who would gladly live at peace, causing innocent blood to be shed, and sending souls unprepared to their account. There are then, obviously, reasons why God may in His goodness have enjoined *absolute submission* to the supreme authority of the state, even though in some cases that owed to inferior authorities may be dispensed with. But in fact, absolute submission has been peremptorily commanded to *all* human authority, except when the law of God intervenes; and in any such extreme cases, in which men are called upon actively to resist the inferior, they are in fact obeying the superior. "We ought to choose to serve the higher," says S. Aug. No exception then is made out; and so it were well that men should reverently weigh the awful words, the more awful as coming at the close of the Epistle which so largely discourses of God's mercy in Christ, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God; so then he who resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God; AND THEY WHO RESIST SHALL RECEIVE TO THEMSELVES DAMNATION." We have nothing to do with dispensing God's judgments; but we may, at least, on the other side, beware the sentence against those, "who knowing the judgments of God that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, *but have pleasure* in them that do them."

Nor will the distinction alleged^e between the Roman Emperors whom S. Paul commanded to obey, and the supreme but limited authority in modern states, avail any thing. And that on two grounds; 1. that there is no proof of the alleged compact; 2. that Scripture commands men to obey not legal only, but illegal authority. It were indeed very dangerous to leave it to the subject to determine, when or under what circumstances the Sovereign broke his coronation oath, and thereby according to this theory absolved them from their allegiance. It is known that George III. regarded an act, which afterwards received the royal assent, as contrary to that oath, i. e. according to this view, (which, since 1688, may be alleged with much more force,) contrary to that compact, on which the Sovereign held his throne. His words, when pressed by Mr. Pitt upon that subject, are well known, "I can go back to Hanover, but I cannot break my oath." There was no doubt also that the act was displeasing to the vast majority of the English nation; they who carried it did not venture to appeal to a fresh and "free Parliament;" it was a revolution, as great in its effects as that of 1688, considered as such. What then could these theorists have said, against a declaration on the part of a convention, that "— having endeavoured to subvert the constitution of the kingdom, by breaking the original contract between king and people, has abdicated or forfeited the government, and that the throne is thereby vacant?"

Even they could hardly hold, (holding as they do that the House of Commons are the delegates of the people,) that the Houses of Parliament could, against the will of the people, with whom the compact was made, absolve the Sovereign from his oath; most (with George III.) would think that they could not, with it. This is in-

^e Edinb. Rev. p. 407.

stanced, only as a recent tangible case to illustrate the danger of any such principles; the oath is the only ground upon which the alleged compact can be maintained; its terms are necessarily large and broad; it would be difficult to prove that James broke it, and so that he broke the compact at all; the proof might make the throne of any monarch precarious,—except that the way in which that compact, since the revolution, would be broken, would be only to the grief of “those who are quiet in the land,” who pray for kings and resist them not. But in truth the oath is an oath to God, not a compact with man; towards man, “the king can do no wrong;” he is responsible, and not the less, but the more awefully responsible, because responsible to God only, the “King of kings, and Lord of lords, and *only* Ruler of princes.”

The king, indeed, at his Coronation, solemnly promises^f

^f The following was the oath taken by James and Charles I, which was not altered before the Revolution. 1. “Sir, Will you grant and keep, and by your oath confirm to the people of England, the laws and customs to them granted by the Kings of England, your lawful and religious predecessors; and especially the laws, customs, and franchises, granted to the Clergy and to the people by the glorious King St. Edward your Predecessor? 2. Sir, Will you keep to the Church of God, the Clergy, and people, peace and concord in God entirely, according to your power? 3. Sir, Will you to your power cause law, justice, and discretion in mercy and truth to be executed in all your judgments? 4. Sir, Will you grant to hold and keep the laws and rightful customs, which the commonalty of your kingdom have, and to defend and uphold them to the honour of God so much as in you lye?” (Prynne’s *Signal Loyalty of God’s true saints towards their kings*, ii. 269, printed from the originals.) After the Revolution, the first was altered thus, “Will you solemnly promise and swear to govern the people of this kingdom of England, and the dominions thereto belonging, according to the *statutes in parliament agreed on*, and the laws and customs of the same?” The second was omitted. In the third, the word “discretion” only is omitted. For the fourth, is substituted “Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the laws of God, the

to his people, that he will discharge such and such duties; but he was king before this promise; for the maxim "The king never dies" goes precisely to this point, that the successor of any particular king, becomes king without any interruption, condition, or uncertainty, by the very fact of the death of the former. "Immediately" upon the decease of the reigning prince in his natural capacity, his kingship of imperial dignity, by act of law, without any interregnum or interval, is vested at once in his heir; who is *eo instante* king to all intents and purposes. And so tender is the law of supposing even a possibility of his death, that his natural dissolution is generally called his *demise, demissio regis vel coronæ*, an expression which signifies merely a transfer of property; for, as is observed in Plowden, when we say the demise of the Crown, we mean that, in consequence of the disunion of the king's natural body from his body politic, the kingdom is transferred or demised to his successor; and so the royal dignity remains perpetual."

true profession of the Gospel, and the protestant reformed religion established by the law? And will you preserve unto the bishops and clergy of this realm, and to the churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain unto them, or any of them?" Blackstone, i. 235. The oath taken by James and Charles I, was the same as that of Richard II. (Signal Loyalty, ii. 246.) It differs remarkably from that subsequent to the Revolution, in that 1. it recognizes the king to be the source of law, "the laws granted by the kings to the people of England?" 2. And not only the original granter of those laws, but the existing king, "Will you grant (concedere) and keep the laws &c." So that we have not only, as was alleged in the Statute, 1 W. and M. st. 1. c. 6. "a change in the wording," in that the Parliament is now for the first time expressly named, but an actual change of principle. But the very alteration of the wording shews that, in their own apprehension, it admitted of question before, and so they were, of course, on their own admission, not justified in asserting so peremptorily that James II. had broken the "original contract."

§ Blackstone, i. 249.

This promise then only the more solemnly confirms the duties to which, by the very fact of becoming king, he already stood pledged ; as, (in as far as one may compare those solemn acts wherein God is pleased to deal with us “ after the manner of men,”) He was already King of His people, and they were His people, yet did it please Him to add to this their original obligation the solemn sanction of mutual promise, “ Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles’ wings and brought you unto Myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey My voice indeed, and keep My covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me, above all people, for the whole earth is Mine. And Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and laid before their faces all these words which the Lord commanded him. And all the people answered together and said, All that the Lord hath spoken, we will do. And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord^b.” This has the forms of, and has been called¹, “ the solemn compact whereon the Jewish Government was founded, in which the Lord Jehovah appeared as the immediate sovereign, and the Jewish people His immediate subjects;” yet were not the Jewish people less solemnly bound before ; God had before spoken of them, as His people, and demanded them, as such, at the hands of Pharaoh ; and they had been previously guilty of murmuring^k, tempting^l, disobedience^m against, Him, which shews that they were already in that situation.

The Covenant with Israel was not made at Mount Sinai, but with the Fathers, four hundred and thirty years before ; this solemn act was an impressive acknowledgment of that mutual relation, but did not constitute it, because it existed before. There is, of course, a

^b Ex. xix.

¹ Graves on the Pentateuch, p. ii. l. iii. p. 260.

^k Ex. xvi. 8—12.

^l Chap. xvii. 2. 7.

^m Chap. xvi. 28.

manifest difference between a compact of man with God or with his fellowman, because "He is faithful, and cannot deny Himself," or break His covenant: but the case illustrates this, that there may be a mutual promise, even where the relation existed before. Again, the Coronation is a solemn act of worship, wherein God, by His ministers, confers His authority on each successive king, who thus becomes "the anointed of the Lord:" it is not a compact with the people, nor do they delegate to the king a power which they have not, but an oath to God, and a sanction and consecration from God to that individual.

But 2. Scripture commands to obey not only lawful, but illegal power. Illegal power has a claim upon the obedience of the subject, when there is no other higher claim conflicting with it. Not only were the Emperors, whom the Apostles bade Christians obey, themselves without any title raised to the throne, but the office, it need not be said, was itself illegal. It was a true tyranny; their accumulation of offices, and all their functions were contrary to existing laws; they were usurpers, exercising unlawful authority; but Scripture bade men obey these; and the principle contained therein is this, that the Christian subject is to submit patiently to whatever the supreme power of the country in which he lives, lays upon him, (obeying whatever is not contrary to conscience, and, since conscience cannot be thereby injured, suffering every thing quietly,) praying "for kings and all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty," and living that quiet and peaceable life, submitting to the authority, whatever it may be, and whether exercised for or against him. "What signifies it," says S. Aug.^a "to this mortal life, which in a few days is passed and closed, what signifies it, under whose rule man lives,

^a De Civ. Dei, v. 17.

while on his way to death, if they who rule do not compel to things unholy and unjust?"

In all this, *nothing has been said, nor was any thing said in any part of the Sermon, implying the Divine right of kings*; it has been maintained broadly that a person must live quietly under the authority of the country in which Divine Providence has placed him, being in fact a sojourner and a pilgrim here, and a citizen of a better country, yet seeking the good of the country in which he sojourns. Still less has any thing been said here or elsewhere implying "an indefeasible hereditary right." This involves a number of difficult questions, into which it was not necessary to enter. For those who lived at that time, and had taken the oath, the whole case appears to us very plain; they had sworn allegiance not only to the existing monarch but to his heirs; even such, as had not taken it, had been born under the rule of an hereditary line of kings, and so it can hardly be held that the son of James II., (especially being born while his father was the acknowledged king,) was not born with a title to the throne, that injustice was not committed or guilt contracted by passing him over, that he was not the rightful king. But when those generations had passed away, and others had sprung up, born under the rule of the new line, and bound by no pledges to the old, the case was in a great measure altered; the rising of 1745 was different from that of 1715, and this again from the first attempt of James II. to recover his kingdom in Ireland. Those who lived at those periods had cases to solve of more or less difficulty; and it would be presumptuous to pronounce, that the Scotch, born members of an antient strict hereditary kingdom, were wrong, even in 1745, in obeying him, who demanded their allegiance, as their lawful king. For

a voluntary attempt to disturb the king *de facto*, and an obedience to the king *de jure*, if he reappear to claim it of those on whom he *has* a claim (whoever these may be) are obviously very different. It has been annexed as a penalty to a first wrong step, whether in public or private morals, that it involves persons in perplexities from which in a straight course they had been free; so that not only do they increase their own difficulties in seeing or doing their duty, through the bias which any such act gives the mind, but they make those duties themselves more intricate and complex. A person who has done a private wrong, very often, after a time, cannot repair it without doing a further wrong to another person. Such reparation as could be offered, would be a fresh injury. Even short of this, a case will often become so involved, that a person finds it difficult to decide, which way his duty really lies, though bent upon performing it, if he could decide. This is acknowledged even in public matters, though there is rarely there so much conscientiousness, and consequently there is so much the more real perplexity. Thoughtful minds feel that the nation lies under the guilt of sacrilege for the spoliations under Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elizabeth; yet how to remedy this, after the spoliations have been confirmed by time, they have not seen; or again, to take a case of secular politics, whether, on the restoration of any lawful dynasty, they who have been dispossessed of their estates during a period of illegal rule, should recover them, or they retain them who have lawfully purchased them from that unlawful power? However decided, the decision has seemed harsh and unjust; the restored government both in France and England allowed those to suffer whom it would naturally have most favoured,—its own adherents, so difficult did it find it to adjust the conflicting claims. So also, whenever by men's own mis-

conduct or that of their forefathers, a disputed succession has arisen, the duty of allegiance, elsewhere so plain and simple, became greatly obscured; and he who should pronounce such or such an act to involve the sin of rebellion, knows little of the deep instinctive fixedness of the human affections, and would confound the mere decision of a majority, (if it were such,) with the will of God.

But the case is obviously wholly altered, when the hereditary line becomes extinct; the existence of the family of the Stuarts was a memorial against us; there was a direct line of princes, who each in succession would have sat upon the throne, inheriting it from his father; and though it might not be difficult to say, when they should have ceased to claim allegiance, it was not easy to decide, when the subject ceased to owe it, if claimed. One born under James II. was clearly bound to him and to his son; was his son's allegiance different from his own? or since the son of James II. was entitled to their allegiance, was not also his son's son? These, as the history of Scotland shews, were practically questions of real difficulty; if many could without scruple or compromise remain tranquil under the new dynasty, even when their allegiance was claimed by the representative of the old, yet many doubtless in so doing consulted their safety rather than their conscience, many were perplexed. But since the hereditary right is derived from the paternal character of government and the affection due to the king and his son and his son's son after him, it is equally a fact, that the extinction of the descendants of James II. removed all these harassing difficulties. It were absurd to parallel a case, wherein a Convention, illegally brought together, in a state of anarchy, excluded the heir-apparent to the throne, or those who were yet in the loins of the father, (as in the case of the lineal descendants of James II.) with that wherein one, *de*

facto king, in concurrence with the two Houses of Parliament, and having to ascend upwards for the nearest of kin, selected the descendants of an aunt in preference to those of a niece. The first, the consciences of many, who shared in it, rebelled at, (whence they so readily believed the heir of James II. to be supposititious,) the other is an abstract question, belonging to the constitutions of empires, but no way affecting allegiance. Still more absurd would it be, at any time after the line of James II. was finally extinct, to affect to raise any question, because the line then on the throne had, nearly two centuries past, parted off one generation higher than another. Under ordinary circumstances, it might be well, in order to avoid disputes, to adhere to a rule, even in such a case as this, and to leave nothing to choice; but it would be the mere pedantry of legalism, to represent it as involving the whole principle of hereditary succession; the objection on principle to the "act of succession" was, that it set aside the line of James, not that it preferred that of the House of Hanover to that of Orleans: whether, of princesses who had been married into foreign families, and become part of them, the descendant of the one or the other should be preferred, was obviously a different question, and one which never excited any scruple. Either were foreigners, not our hereditary princes. The line, which (if we measured the succession to the crown, by the legal rule which amongst us settles the succession of property) was passed by, has passed, first, into the family of Orleans, then into that of Sardinia, and now again is transplanted into that of Modena°. Whatever lawyers, accustomed to the technicalities of their profession, may think, they will never persuade

° In the Preface it is said "the King of Sardinia;" the Edinburgh Reviewer, who probably does not recollect the time when it was the King of Sardinia, has rightly corrected the "Duchess of Modena;" for the King of Sardinia, who died in 1824, left no male issue.

men that the principles of hereditary succession may not be fully acknowledged, without tying down the succession of the Crown to all the minute rules which regulate the inheritance of a farm. The blessing spoken of by God is, "He shall never want a son to sit on his throne;" this our service recognizes as a blessing, "that our posterity may see his children's children and peace upon Israel;" but this withdrawn, it were affectation to say that any principle whatever is involved in taking the next of kin a century or two back; any reason in the nature of things, why persons should not go to the branch nearest the original stock, as well as to that which has latest separated, the eldest as well as the youngest, the head as well as the tail. The fact, that persons were not content with the succession, so long as the direct line of James II. existed, and that all have been contented since, outweighs all such petty technicalities. The Jacobites did doubt the right of the present family before; they have not doubted it since^p, and so the unhappy distinction has been merged. For these reasons I distinctly waived the question of hereditary right as wholly irrelevant^q; the reign of William and Mary was the direct produce of rebellion; that of the House of Hanover of an act of settlement passed, at least, as was said, "in a more orderly way." And the principles of the Non-Jurors have nothing at variance with their full recognition.

Now, however, not only has any perplexity been removed, (such as, it is known, conscientious men, and peaceful subjects did feel,) but (it may be freely said) the restoration of things to their former state, wherein they were before any act of disobedience, may by pious minds

^p The Edinburgh Rev. supposes, that Sir W. Scott must have gone on his technical principles, and consequently have been ignorant that the present line was not nearest of kin to James II; he had better have imagined that he was not so ignorant, and so did not go on his technicalities.

^q Pref. p. viii.

be acknowledged with thankfulness as the act of God's mercy, undoing what we had done amiss, and reforming what we had deformed: and so, since it has pleased Him that the direct line of the Stuarts should become extinct, one may look upon this, not only as removing the last possible doubt as to the claims of the present line upon the obedience of all their subjects, but as effacing for the most part, if not altogether, the blot which stained our shield. And so again, one may think that regular succession (as it was allotted to the line of Judah in marked contrast to the broken reigns of Israel) is the more religious and happy lot, as not taking things into our own hands, and reposing more confidence in God, as the calmer proceeding and having less of self, without therefore insisting that it is, in all cases, essential. This was not asserted, but rather the contrary, and the blessings of regular succession no reflecting person will probably deny.

And so, without denying that the authorities of a republic are included under the Scripture sanction, or that they who have the misfortune to be born under one, are bound to obey them, one may hold that the regal form comes more within the letter of Scripture, has *more* sanction from it, enjoys this sanction directly, (whereas others have it by way of inference only,) and is more in accordance with the will of God. And some reason of this we may see, in that the more a form of government encourages the character of tranquil submission, and discourages self in the mass of the nation, so much the more favourable is it to the development of the Christian character. Compare the tone of mind produced by the Republican form of Government (in State, and for the most part in Church) on a nation descended immediately from ourselves, with that which in the main belongs to the bulk of the English people, or again, the effects of dissenting, with

that of real Church, education, and it will appear how much more the Patriarchal Government fosters a humble, generous, unselfish, spirit—one might say, how intrinsically selfish, civil or ecclesiastical Republicanism in itself is; however it may be modified, or even subdued, in individuals living under it. And on this ground Aristotle, whose abiding influence on the human mind is a guarantee for his understanding it, rests mainly his unhesitating dictum^r, “of the three forms of Government, kingly rule is the best, republican* the worst.” For contrasting kingly with its deflection, tyrannic rule, he says, “both are monarchies, but they differ exceedingly; for the tyrant seeks his own advantage, the king that of the ruled; *for he is not a king, unless he is independent*, and possesses every good more than others; but such an one is in want of nothing; he then would look out for which might benefit, not himself but the ruled; for he who was not thus independent would be a sort of elective king.” An independent king is the most unselfish, and the more removed a government is from kingly, the more selfish, according to Aristotle, it is, and the wider that selfishness is extended.

Again the more assimilated a government is to paternal or patriarchal rule, so much the more primitive is it, and the more does it correspond and harmonize with the first instincts and feelings of our nature. Then also regal government is a little image of the government of God; a slight emblem truly, as every thing must be, yet still enough so to have a propriety and intrinsic beauty which no other has. The republican change in the prayer of our Lord (one would not wish to bring it to the recollection of any, who knows it not) strikes every one probably not simply

^r Eth. Nicom. viii. 9.

^s Lit. “Timocracy,” of which Democracy is regarded by Aristotle as the degenerate state.

as offensive, (in that man ventured to change His prayer, but as grotesque, as having an intrinsic absurdity and impropriety: i. e. our instinctive feeling is, that what is under the immediate protection of God, and has His immediate Presence, must be His "Kingdom." The selection of a king as one of the offices, whereby to shadow forth our Lord before His coming, confers on the office an eminence and title to our veneration, which no other civil form can possess. It has been consecrated by being brought into relation with Him; as it shadowed forth Him, so a portion of His effulgence has streamed back upon it; and commands and draws our affection and reverence.

Without then asserting any Divine right of kings in such sense as to pronounce any other form of government unlawful, or going at all into the question of "succession;" one may say, that kingly rule comes recommended to us by natural feeling, by practical experience, by its tendencies; but, above all these, by its having been chosen by God, as the mode in which He should represent His rule, by His having once delegated to it His authority, by His sanctioning[†] it among His people (however in their mode of asking for it at last, that people may, through faithless fear, have sinned) by His causing it frequently, and alone to be sanctioned by Holy Scripture, by His making it an image of that blessed rule, wherein all those, who submit to the easy yoke of His Son, find their peace. Here as in so many other cases, intimations have been

[†] The Edinb. Rev. p. 405. ventures to follow Locke in speaking of Jephthah's "articling with the people" as a proof that "the general organization of the twelve tribes at that period was neither more nor less than republican—unscriptural as the phrase may appear"—unscriptural indeed, when "the Lord their God was their king." Both alike forgot that the Jewish Government was a theocracy; that there was no power of altering the laws, placed any where, and that the chief judges were priests, giving sentence in the Name, and in the House of God.

given sufficient for those who wish to follow out what they think to be most pleasing to God. The evidence recommends itself in great part to men's affections, and will have no weight with such as suppress their affections or have them not; it implies a reverent contemplation of God's Providence, such as looks upon nothing, not even the sparrow's falling to the ground, as chance; so then, whereas the opposite spirit would argue that kings are commanded to be obeyed in Scripture, because the then governments *happened* to be kingly, it would rather consider that they were therefore ordered to be then kingly, nay and to have been occupied by bad and unlawful kings, in order that a sanction might be given to the rule best adapted for man, and all excuse be taken away from rebellion. And there would be this practical difference, that a Christian living under a democracy, should feel that his country had, in whatever way, forfeited a privilege, one living under a monarchy, that he therein possessed one. The one should be anxious to maintain that he has, the other, although he must submit to his authorities, such as they are, and use no means to remove them, must still wish that the commonwealth might revert to the more primitive state, as one more in accordance with God's will, and freer from moral disadvantages. Such, at least, must be the case wherever the Church is not co-extensive with the State, and has not won the State to herself. The Church has within herself a regal, as well as a prophetic and a priestly office, committed to her; for a real member of the Church, it matters little what constitution he lives under; for whatever there is unselfish and elevating in monarchy, belongs in a much higher degree to the spiritual authority of the Church. Should then the will of God be, that the present democratical principle should be the destruction of earthly monarchies, and that the Church should be purified

by the desolation which was their destruction, and her powers and influence thereby developed, she might, unaided, well correct all those evils, to which now earthly monarchy is the counterpoise. What then is contended for, relates to the present mixed state of things, wherein the Church is imperfectly developed.

What, however, was contended for, was not the Divine origin of *kingly* rule, but the Divine origin of *government*. That which was designated as the "unbelieving theory" presupposes, as the original state of things, one which Christians know not to have existed, and that whatever approximation to it any where occurred, was a state of debasement. It assumes the most degraded state in which we now find man, to have been his original condition, that he lived much like the beasts which he hunted and whereon he subsisted, in a half brutish state; that thence he gradually formed societies, submitting himself, according to his exigencies, to the most experienced warrior or the most skilful huntsman, abridging his own natural rights, and entering into a compact with the chief whom he elected. Hence it is inferred, that since he was at one time in a state out of society, he was free to enter into it upon what terms he pleased, and, upon non-fulfilment of those terms, his original rights returned; that power emanated from below, from the people, and might be resumed at their will.

Quum prorepserunt primis animalia terris,
Mutum et turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia propter
Unguibus et pugnibus, dein fustibus, atque ita porro
Pugnabant armis, quæ post fabricaverat usus;
Donec verba, quibus voces sensusque notarent,
Nominaque invenere; dehinc absistere bello,
Oppida cœperunt munire, et condere leges";

^u Hor. Sat. i. 3. 99 sqq.

is the heathenish and Epicurean * source of some boasted modern theories on the origin of language and government. Holy Scripture, on the other hand, instructs us, as was said, that man was not originally in such a state; that the savage state is the degradation and decay, not the birth-place or cradle of our race; that man never was out of society, and accordingly cannot be regarded as entering into it *de novo*; it exhibits to us families *separating*, "overspreading the whole earth," not *combining* into societies; it derives the existence of nations from families, having in them a right of primogeniture, and these derived from a single head, an emblem of unity, and the source of authority. Scripture thrice repeats †, "By these [the sons of Japheth] were the isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands; every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations:" "these are the sons of Ham, after their families, after their tongues in their countries, in their nations:" "these are the sons of Shem, after their families, after their tongues in their lands, after their nations:" and then sums them up in their single head, "these are the families of the sons of Noah after their generations in their nations, and by these were the nations divided in the earth after the flood."

Man, then, never was in a state, in which to make terms for himself, unless when he forfeited the state in which it had pleased God to place him. These are sufficient indications, that, until God selected a peculiar people and priests, the priesthood and patriarchal authority descended with the primogeniture; and it is remarkable how the most ancient traces of society which we have, external to the Bible,—those in Homer, still retain the character impressed upon it originally by God. Aristotle ‡, again,

* Comp. Lucret. v. 923—1115. † Gen. x. ‡ Eth. Nicom. l. c.

remarkably points out the connection of kingly and paternal with Divine rule, of which they are effluences. "Images and types, as it were, of the different sorts of government, you may find in families. For the relation of the father to his sons, has the character of regal rule; for the father takes care of his sons; whence also Homer calls Jupiter 'Father;' for the regal aims at being a paternal rule."

And thus God, who at the beginning created all things in One, even in His Eternal Word, and "made of *one* blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth^a," and, when these lower things had dissipated themselves, and, by breaking the bonds of obedience, had rent the band which held them to Him the Centre of all Unity, and were severed from Himself and from each other, "gathered together in One all things in Christ^b,"—He, "the lover of concord," imparted unity and harmony and affection to all our relations by making them spring from one source. From the closest relation of a single family to that widest which embraces the whole family of mankind,—family, clan, tribe, nation, language, kindred, tongues,—He has impressed the character of family upon the whole human race; long separation effaces it not; a family likeness remains in those longest severed, and a kindred tone of mind and feeling abides, as a source of union,—(such as cements ourselves more naturally to the German tribes than to the French, or, yet farther, makes us feel more akin to the sons of Japhet than to the Eastern descendants of Shem, or the black progeny of Ham)—but yet, at the very last, there is one outermost band, which comprehends the whole, not simply that we are man (*homo sum*.) but men descended from one common stock, and so

^a Acts xvii. 26.

^b Eph. i. 10. *ἑνωσιφραλακίωσασθαι*, "gather together in one Head."

owing to each other not only the duties of a common nature, but the affections of an uneffaceable, inextinguishable kindred. "Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us? why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother?" And not only has God bound each several relation together, by thus setting out from unity, but has intertwined them one with the other, and, in that He made the kingdom to spring out of the family, He tempered kingly rule with the affectionateness of the paternal, and gave it the reverend authority of a father, and has exhibited the majesty of fatherly authority in the glory of kingly rule, while to each He delegated part of His attributes—to the parent, His creative^d power to give life to that which was not, to the kingly authority His irresponsible sovereignty,—and would be preeminently loved in the one, and feared in the other, yet loved also in the king, and an object of awe in the father.

"The "Non-Jurors" it has been well said^c, "believed the fifth commandment contained the origin and force of all government; it assumed the bible account of the first foundation of society, the way in which the great God and Father of all formed society in the beginning, and thus communicated ever afterwards His divine authority to the families, and so on to the kingdoms of the earth. They held in the sublimest and fullest sense that doctrine of which Aristotle caught a glimpse, when he said, "ἐν οἰκίᾳ πρῶτον ἄρχαι καὶ πῆγμα πολιτείας καὶ δικαίου," and which is so beautifully drawn out in the first few sentences of our duty towards our neighbour in the Church Catechism."

It has been made a reproach to these principles, that

^c Mal. ii. 10.

^d A testimony of language hereto is furnished by the words παιδοπασιῶν, &c. which analogy runs through many languages.

^e British Critic, No. 41. Account of the Non-Jurors, p. 45, 6.

they are antiquated, that they have lain so long dormant. It is said ;

“ These doctrines went so quietly to sleep^f, that he who now arouses them from their century of oblivion may fairly be termed an innovator,” “ a class of writers whom the *world* had pretty generally consigned to a contemptuous oblivion.”

It is a reproach to us and our people that they have lain so long comparatively dormant ; but it was an inevitable consequence of the act of 1688. The “ contemptuous oblivion” was that of men who had acted against a law ; despised the law of God in act, and then strove to forget what was a reproach to them, like the foolish woman who “ forgetteth the covenant of her God.” Who but the penitent wishes to keep in memory laws or principles which he has violated ? These doctrines had indeed, as has been observed^g, been much shaken by the continuance of the first rebellion, and, some time before the second, Bp. Morley^h saw that there were “ few who yet held the doctrine

^f Edinb. Rev. p. 399. The Reviewer, with an amusing inconsistency, speaks, in the same breath, in a martial tone, of “ buckling on once more the armour of our old revolution principles, which has stood the buffets of an hundred and fifty years too well to be now laid aside at the first blast of a hostile challenge, even though wafted from the cloisters of Oxford ;” “ has stood the rust of 150 years,” he should have said, on his own shewing. These “ buffets” are like the escape of that valiant knight from the men in buckram. “ I am eight times thrust through the doublet ; four, through the hose ; my sword hacked like a handsaw ; *ecce signum*. I never dealt better since I was a man ; all would not do.” The only antagonist which the “ old revolution principles” have had to stand against, have been the “ new revolution principles ;” but “ all would not do.” Against these, they, as being inconsistent in themselves, have not stood. See Burke’s Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs.

^g Pref. p. ix, x. Sermon p. 47. and note s.

^h “ Not long before his (Bishop Morley’s) death, (for he then kept his chamber,) my father carried me with him to Farnham Castle. I

of non-resistance, that it would not stand in the day of trial." But the act of 1688 overthrew what was before tottering: it was the overt act of its abandonment, and fixed our loss of it for long after. It was not merely that these doctrines were held down, together with the Church, by presbyterian monarchs; or that they were unpalatable to those, whose throne had been set up by their violation, but that men had, from that time, two conflicting duties, that of allegiance to the rightful sovereign, and that of peaceable submission to the sovereign, whom God had allowed to be set over them, to "the powers that be" so long as He should allow them to "be." This extended to all; all conscientious men (and it is not until these are compelled to sanction any set of opinions that they will even for a time prevail) however they might wish for the restoration of James, as undoing a national sin, must acquiesce in the duty of submitting to the king *de facto*; and this would have a tendency to relax views, contradicted by the existing state of things, under which men were living and acting. Action is the life of principle. To the Non-Jurors this was supplied by "suffering for conscience sake;" their whole subsequent life, and the privations in which it was passed, were an enacting of their principles, and so with them these principles abode. Those, on the contrary, who remained

was not above twelve years old, but remember the Bishop talked much of the Duke, and concluded with desiring my father to tell him from him, that if ever he depended upon the doctrine of non-resistance, he would find himself deceived, for there were very few of that opinion though there were not many of the Church of England that thought proper to contradict it in terms, but was very sure they would in practice. My father told me he had frequently put King James in mind of Morley's last message to him, though to very little purpose: for all the answer was, that the Bishop was a very good man but was grown old and timorous." Lord Dartmouth MS. note on Burnet, ap. Dalr. App. p. 289.

in the Establishment, the *Juring* Clergy, were the more injured by this very opposition of principles; they who could not, from whatever motive, make up their minds to "forsake all," had to justify themselves to their own consciences. They had chosen a part which, however they veiled it from themselves, involved a compromise of their former principles; and it was on this principle so modified, or confused, that they acted; and their action must, in their own despite, bend their principle.

It is not necessary to suppose any sordid motives in all those who retained their preferments, and took the oaths to William; even Beveridge, though he took the good Archbishop's advice, and, when he was offered Bp. Ken's not-vacant office, "said Nolo from his heart," must have taken the oaths; and Bp. Patrick bore to occupy a seat, whose possessor God had not yet translated to his rest. These must have had some means of satisfying themselves. Bp. Lloyd of St. Asaph, who seems to have had the more weight, as having been one of the seven Bishops, who had suffered in the popular cause of resisting James, although happily he only, with one other, avoided the unattractive unpopular suffering, involved in declining the oaths to William, was imposed upon, it is said¹, by Burnet. He justified himself at one time, it seems, as if the oath was only a promise to live quietly under William², at another, that "acquisition begets right³;" Dr. Tenison^m, afterwards Archbishop, on the ground, "that though it were to be wished it had been otherwise, yet now we were to make the best of it, and join the government, as it was, for fear of a worse." These two theories probably comprised the *Juring* Clergy; that of Lloyd proceeding on the theory that William had acquired his throne by conquestⁿ over

¹ Clarendon Diary, p. 117.

² *Ib.* 172.

³ *Ib.* 123.

^m *Ib.*

ⁿ See above App. i. p. 68.

James, which, though untenable in fact, involved in itself so far no sacrifice of principle, and so "brought^o off the greatest number of those, who came in honestly to the new government;" that of Tenison went on the duty of submitting to existing governments. The excuse devised by Lloyd of St. Asaph justified the oath, but was false in fact; that felt doubtless by Tenison, was right in itself, but availed nothing towards justifying the oath. The oath, although considerably modified, in that it omitted any mention of William's being the "lawful and rightful king," still involved the abjuration of King James, since, though it may be often the duty of a Christian to obey usurpers, he can bear "faith and true allegiance" to one sovereign only at once. Whatever allowance, then, may be made for the difficulties of the times, the *principles* have been justly stigmatized, which could enable a man to take an oath of allegiance to William, reserving^p in his own mind the single case, that King James should again be in a condition to re-demand it. It is very possible that many may have taken the oath in the first instance, (whether persuaded by authority or any of those mixed motives which blind men's eyes,) with indistinct notions of the extent of the fealty which it involved; and thus, they were caught, as it were, and committed to principles, other than they meant, or drew back inconsistently. The case, however, of such as kept altogether aloof from politics, wrapt up in the care of their immediate plot in the vineyard, or (as Bull) living in other times, among the fathers of the Christian Church, and bent only upon bringing out their treasures for the use of after-ages, is again different. These may well be excused, if they paid no more attention to the difference between James and William, than St. Paul may be conceived to have done

^o Burnet v. fin.

^p Burnet ib.

to that between Claudius and Nero. Such would take the oath in the simple sense of obeying quietly any authority, aiding none, but letting these things pass over them, like wintry clouds which hid not from them their Sun.

It is of moment to notice the first principles upon which people act, since these will enter into their future conduct, even though subsequently modified. Had the oath of abjuration, "acknowledging William as lawful and rightful king, and denying the right and title of the Prince of Wales," been proposed in the first instance, men's consciences would have revolted at it, and most of the Clergy, at least, would probably have become Non-Jurors. Proposed as it was, towards the end of the reign of William, it was taken probably in the same acceptation in which they had already familiarized themselves to take the former. Inexplicable as it seems that any should take it who yet held their allegiance to King James, it does not appear that either the number of the Non-Jurors was much increased, or the secret acknowledgment of King James at once abandoned. There seems too much room for the insulting triumph⁹ over these men's entangled consciences, as there is much truth in the concluding remark ;

"The dominant faction might enjoy perhaps a charitable [?] pleasure in exposing many of their adversaries, and especially the high Church Clergy, to the disgrace and remorse of perjury. Few or none however who had taken the oath of allegiance, refused this additional cup of bitterness, though so much less defensible, according to the principles they had employed to vindicate their compliance in the former instance; so true is it that, in matters of conscience, the first scruple is the only one which costs much to overcome."

Still the oath, however imperfectly received, or however

⁹ Hallam, t. iii. p. 265.

miserable the history of that imperfection, must have had considerable, though a gradual influence; they who took it in these inadequate senses, were not therefore hypocrites or perjured, but men who wished to do their duty quietly, although they saw not the highest obligations of duty, or could not make up their minds to see them, so as to be obliged to abandon every thing for them. As time went on, and the restoration of King James or the accession of his son became more improbable, the oath would gradually become more equivalent to what it ought 'ever to have been, a simple "promise of peaceable obedience;" would thus be taken with a fuller acquiescence, and so would more fully proscribe the principles to which this abjuration of King James was opposed.

The oath also had made it well-nigh impossible for those who took it, explicitly to maintain their own principles; those principles therefore became of necessity indistinct and confused, if not debased and cowardly; and these have no means of maintaining their ground against more defined views. Those of the Revolution of 1688, although assailable from the ancient position of the Church, or liable to be dragged on into a more consistent extreme, (as by moderns they have been,) were still more tenable than any which could be opposed to them by such as had acknowledged the Prince of Orange; they had, at all events, the appearance of straight-forwardness, and those who did not fall back upon a stronger position, must of necessity gradually fall into them. Thus in the trial of Dr. Sacheverel, it was remarked with triumph, that his defenders had in fact taken up the principles of the Revolution².

Practical men further, (and perhaps the English, as a too

¹ Hallam, *ib.*

² Burke Appeal from the new to the old Whigs, Works, vi. 161—3.

merely practical nation) are apt to neglect principles when not directly embodied in practice. It seems to them useless to maintain or enquire into principles, which cannot be carried out immediately into practice. As soon as William was, in whatever way, made king, the present duty of peaceable subjection to him, probably went far to efface the dormant claims of King James. Claims, for the time, suspended, would give way to the more vivid impression of actual obedience. The speech of Lord Nottingham to Burnet¹ probably expressed the practical character of mind of very many of the laity, "though he could not agree to the making a king, as things stood, yet, if he found one made, he would be more faithful to him, than those who made him could be on their own principles."

Again, after the defeat of King James at the Boyne had extinguished all prospect of his restoration, there was apparently no practical end in maintaining doctrines, which could not then be maintained without tending to unsettle the allegiance to the existing authorities. Even although the new throne was made hereditary, yet to insist strongly upon hereditary rights was to maintain those of the heir of King James; to maintain the doctrine of absolute submission was to impugn the claims of the existing family. As the feelings of dutiful submission were thus cut off from the past, so neither had they any present object, around which to entwine themselves. The new line was suspicious of loyalty to which they had no claim. It has been truly though bitterly said²;

¹ Burnet's Own Times, v. fin. "They thought" they said "a king thus *de facto* had a right to their obedience, and that they were bound to adhere to him, and to defend him even in opposition to him with whom they thought the right did still remain. The Earl of Nottingham was the person that owned this doctrine the most during these debates."

² Hallam, p. 124. see also on the trial of Dr. Sacheverel, p. 275, sqq.

"The ministers of William III. and of the house of Brunswick had no choice but to respect and countenance the doctrines of Locke, Hoadley, and Molesworth. The assertion of passive obedience to the Crown grew obnoxious to the Crown itself. Our new line of sovereigns scarcely ventured to hear of their hereditary right, and dreaded the cup of flattery that was drugged with poison. This was the greatest change that affected our monarchy by the fall of the house of Stuart."

Lastly, the act which had taken place, must in itself, for the time, fix the national character in one direction. Beyond what took place in the minds of individuals, a tone was thus given to the character of the whole nation. Not a party, as in the first rebellion, but the whole nation, by acquiescence, at least, was implicated, and it has not repented. It was often insisted by older defenders of the Revolution, that little was changed^x, that it was but "one exception to a general rule," that it was a case of necessity, of *extreme* necessity^y, the utmost necessity^z; they conceded that^a

"the doctrine that commands obedience to the supreme power, *though in things contrary to nature*, even to suffer death, which is the highest injustice that can be done a man, rather than make an opposition to the supreme power [*is reasonable,*] because the death of one, or some few private persons is a less evil than disturbing the whole government ;"

and pleaded only for the single case of the Revolution. But, in moral conduct, the exception is for the most part, just the touchstone of a man's character; one violation of the moral law degrades a whole character; one violation

^x See e. g. a strong passage in Burke, speech in the House of Commons, Feb. 9, 1790, quoted l. c. p. 168, note.

^y Sir J. Jekyl ap. Burke, l. c. p. 161, 2.

^z Mr. (Sir R.) Walpole, *ib.* 159. and so the rest.

^a Sir J. Hawles, one of the managers of the prosecution, *ib.* p. 155. The Italics and the words inclosed in brackets are in Burke.

of honesty, purity, faith, taints the whole man; it has changed him, although he be afterwards even honest, pure, and faithful: one violation of obedience to the "ordinance of God" has changed the character and destiny of a whole nation. We are not what we were.

"The laws^b were not so materially altered as the spirit and sentiments of the people. Hence those who look only at the former, have been prone to underrate the magnitude of this revolution. The fundamental maxims of the constitution, both as they regard the king and the subject, may seem nearly the same, but the disposition with which they were received and interpreted were entirely different.—Laws and statutes as remedial, nay more closely limiting the prerogative than the bill of rights and act of settlement, might possibly have been obtained from James himself, as the price of his continuance on the throne, or from his family as that of their restoration to it. But what the revolution did for us was this; it broke a spell that had charmed the nation. It cut up by the roots all that theory of indefeasible right, of paramount prerogative, which had put the crown in continual opposition to the people."

Not only, however, were the principles carried out in a large body into a virtual republicanism, but the event shook the feelings of loyalty among quiet people. Their obedience might be transferred, their reverence could not. A better authority^c says in 1777,

"The state of the country is this; the people knowing it to be agreed on all hands, that this king has not the hereditary right to the crown, and there being no hope that he who has it can be restored, have grown cold and indifferent upon the subject of loyalty, *and have no warm attachment to any king.*"

One need not follow into modern times the history of this change of opinion, or ask whether research into first

^b Hallam, iii. p. 124.

^c Dr. Johnson, ap. Boswell's Life, Sept. 17, 1777.

principles has been indeed our characteristic, and so, whether it was our depth or shallowness which for a time seemed well nigh to obliterate its traces. Yet the development of the opposite principles has prepared their destruction; the first French Revolution happily checked their growth among us, and the almost contemporary death of the last claimant of the English throne, and the virtual extinction of that branch of the House of Stuart, have left men free to form an unwarped judgment.

We are not what we were; but by God's blessing we may again be, in principle, if not in our future doom, and even that doom may be mitigated; principles which have been bent down by transitory circumstances, or their expression repressed by a sense of duty, may yet again, now that pressure is removed, burst forth into open day, "strike root downwards, and bear fruit upwards." The principles are deeply fixed not in occasional Services, but in our daily worship; they are not brought before us only by the recurrence of a yearly fast, but in our most solemn worship, in the Communion; "the old Homilies," in which a flip-pant infidel said that they "sculked^d," have been preserved from the attempts of the Archbishop^e of the Revolution, and are appealed to as authority, and are circulated widely as the teaching of the people^f. It seems a sign of

^d Bolingbroke, quoted *ib.* p. 399.

^e Abp. Tillotson, who though with reluctance, took the office of Abp. Sancroft.

^f "The Homilies" (says Mr. Hallam, t. iii. p. 280, note) "are so much more vehement against resistance than Sacheverell was, that it would have been awkward to pass a rigorous sentence on him. In fact, he or any other clergyman had a right to preach the homily against rebellion instead of a sermon. As to their laying down general rules without adverting to the exceptions, an apology which the managers set up for them, it was just as good for Sacheverell: and the Homilies expressly deny all possible exceptions."

God's favour, that we may now, without impeachment of present duty, review the acts of our forefathers, and our own acquiescence in them ; it seems as if, now the opposite doctrines have grown, their advocates were ready to abandon the manure of the Revolution, which fostered them, and in which (though any see it not) their life is still wrapped up. "The Revolution," it is said by its defenders^a, "has for us no more sanctity than any other great political act, of which the consequences yet survive." The difficulties then in disowning it, are diminished ; the panic of Popery soon subsided, and left the mass of the nation, at least in England, indifferent to it ; politicians only, who wished to build on upon the foundation so laid, or to extol themselves and their own party, gave it a spurious celebrity ; or, so long as a claimant to the throne existed, were obliged to maintain it ; but it never could have any hold upon people's affections ; it was a calculating affection which they bore it. It is indeed one thing to condemn the principles of the Revolution, and another to act upon the principles, which condemn it ; it is a difficult task to take shame to ourselves for what we gloried in, and for having gloried in it ; but it is yet more difficult to unlearn "the heathen notions of manliness and nobleness of character, of which we are so unwilling to divest ourselves." "How many," says its late upholder^b well, "how many devices of worldly wisdom, how many false systems of worldly honour and morality, how many rebelling impulses of the heart, are crushed by this stern command !"

They, too, who would maintain the ancient principles of Non-resistance, must prepare for obloquy and the charge of inconsistency which was ever the share of the Church at the hands of the world. At first, also, men's unacquaintance

^a Edinb. Rev. p. 398.

^b Ib. p. 400.

with the doctrine will expose its upholders to these charges, even from good men. "Non-resistance" seems to be interpreted into "opposing nothing," and "passive obedience" into "non-chalance;" so that, if any oppose what emanates from persons in authority, though neither kings nor bishops, or who have no authority as to that which they recommend, or none over those to whom they recommend it, or have authority as a whole, but not as a small minority of that whole, the principles will seem to be infringed. This will soon pass away, as people come to realize the principles, and not speak of them in a scarcely-half-understood reference to former times. But, beyond this, as being religious principles, they cannot be understood by the irreligious or unreligious; they will seem to be violated when they are not, and not to be violated, when they are. Politicians, who are accustomed to the unconscientious servility of worldly men, cannot understand the noble and free service of those, who serve Him, "Whose service is perfect freedom" and "in and for Him" serve those, and, if needs be, suffer from those, to whom He hath delegated His authority; but "for Him" also disobey them, when they command to disobey Him. Such must prepare too to suffer, for lost ground is probably not to be recovered without suffering; not without suffering are men replaced in the state from which they have fallen; and there are signs enough that they who live, must if they would "live godly, suffer persecution;" too happy, if their suffering be, in their Saviour, and in His Name, accepted for His Church.

The above discussion has been lengthened in parts, beyond what might seem necessary for the main subject, or for any immediate practical end, out of respect for the memory of those who had to shape their course in those

difficult times. For us, whose allegiance is clear, it were easy to carry our principles through in theory; but in treating of times, full of perplexities from which we have been freed, it is a duty to our forefathers to take into account difficulties which we do not share; and it may be a warning to posterity, that they may avoid the like. It were easy at once to side with the Revolutionists, or with the Non-Jurors; but the mass of the nation was neither; but felt with the Non-Jurors and acted with the Revolutionists. They had felt, or wished, or acted, up to a certain point, with the Revolutionists, and then were surprised; and while they could not go on with a free conscience, had advanced too far, to find their way back to the secure and elevated position of the simple-minded Non-Jurors. And now, it is easy for both parties to despise them; and the liberal party, whom they unwillingly aided, now feel themselves at liberty to discard them, and to trample on their memories. Yet these off-hand modes of deciding are shallow and unphilosophical, as well as unjust and unchristian; and, therefore, without sharing their perplexities, or approving of their line of conduct, it seemed but due to them, (even at the risk of embarrassing the immediate question,) to attempt to explain some of the grounds upon which they did, or may have acted. We cannot for a moment suppose the main body of the English Clergy, specially of our Universities, such as we know them to have been, to have been perjured, although it seems strange how, with their sentiments, they could have taken the oath of abjuration. But the way to prepare to act with a more self-denying consistency and clearer conscience, is not, hastily to condemn them, but to appreciate their difficulties. And if the like trial befall men in the present course of things, may God, with a greater charity of judging, give them power to act as these should have acted!

The discussion, though relating to the politics of other days, has necessarily become so mainly political, that it becomes necessary to recall to mind to such as share, or inquire into, these views, that their end is not that of present nor of worldly politics. Indeed had it not been so said¹, it would be difficult to conceive what end of present politics they could be thought to answer; for one set of men is now scarcely more committed than another to the principles of "the revolution;" nor are they who are supposed to be the objects of attack, of sufficient moment; they are but unwilling, unconscious instruments of a spirit mightier than they; they follow a popular impulse, which they cannot direct nor guide, tossed about this way or that, as the waves may beat the highest. But apart from this, not secular politics but religious or irreligious principles are the objects of the pulpit; and the act of 1688 was originally animadverted upon, as an illustration of principles under which it falls, but which extend far beyond itself, and that, not for the sake of the State, but of the Church. We love our country, because it is the home, it has been the benefactress, it still recognizes, it in great measure is, and belongs to, the Church, has long been sanctified by her presence, and may once more, we trust, be identified with her; we love it because it was the scene of the good deeds of the fathers of our Church, and is blended with their memory, and guards and still reverences their hallowed ashes; we love it, because in it "our lines have fallen in a goodly heritage," because in it our tasks have been allotted and our crown is to be won. But she is not *the* object of our affections, fair though she be; she is not our Ark, but the mountain only, whereon our Ark for the time dwells; it is

¹ "That day seems to have been selected for a simultaneous pulpit-attack, from the Ecclesiastical high-places of England and Ireland, against her Majesty's Ministers and Commons." *Ib.* p. 396.

for the sake of that Ark, that we "pray for her peace," and if that be bidden to remove, it is not in the deserted hill-top of Zion, but in the living temple, which is "throughout all the world," that our home is. The interests of secular politics is in proportion as they bear upon the Church, and since we know not what is good for her, we must often be in that proportion indifferent about them.

The main object of the Sermon was to inculcate, in the times which are coming upon the earth, patience and self-denial; the Revolution of 1688 was (as the day suggested) animadverted on as a signal case of the reverse, of a fretful and self-depending impatience and self-will; and that, both as an object of repentance, and in warning; the Church has once disobeyed, and she has suffered, not as yet in her temporal estate, but in her spiritual^k; a great revolution in part has, in part is, taking place with regard to the relation of the State to her, which must, at last, break up many of those bonds, which have been entwined round her, since, and as the consequence of, the Revolution; her bondage seems likely to be unintentionally loosened through their agency, who would fain see her "sit in the dust;" and her entrusted powers for the benefit of mankind called out to a greater extent than heretofore. But, as a condition of this high and enlarged office, and of all other duties which may seem to be in store for her, as the reformed Apostolic Church of the West, probation and severity appear to be likely to be allotted to her, as they have been to her branches in Scotland and America. Severity, by an uni-

^k "By the profanation of the *offices* of the Church to strengthen secular parties," the Author meant chiefly her bishoprics, which since the Revolution has been made subservient to political ends, and which were not before, (see the places quoted in the Sermon, p. 48. not. q. r.); he did not mean, (as the Edinb. Rev. has explained it,) of "political services in the Liturgy."

versal law which, since the fall, has been appointed to the whole physical and moral creation of our world, is the condition of the extinction of evil and the growth of good; it is the means of checking physical and moral fever, and destroying the destroyers of the future harvest; it cuts off luxuriance which would waste its strength, and come to no maturity, and even we have learnt in physical things to act upon this rule, and imitate the process; it hardens that which without such hardening would bear no fruit; and in morals we speak of "hardy virtues." These are images of what God has in His Word declared, that "whom He loveth, He chasteneth;" the moral or physical processes which we see or act on, commend to our mind, and assure our faith in, that system which He acts on with ourselves individually, or with our Church; it tells us of its fruits, while it impresses upon us that, in a creation through sin "made subject to vanity¹," together with the sunshine of His favour, there must be seasons when He seemeth to hide His face, and "who can stand before His cold^m;" that coldⁿ as well as heat, winter as well as summer, night as well as day, are part of His covenant with the earth. His secret training of the Heathen prepares us to receive cheerfully even an enlarged portion of these remedial gifts, bitter and grievous for the time, but in the end health and peace and joy. A weak faith murmurs at these gifts, or, when it can, puts them hastily aside, and deprives itself of their fruit, for it cannot recognize God's hand in them; and thus our forefathers, at the Revolution, seeing not in James's measures God's Fatherly, though chastening hand, became impatient with the human instrument, cast aside rudely the cup, which He was tendering to them, and in so doing forfeited the mercies which might have made us a praise in the earth, and fell

¹ Rom. viii. 20.

^m Ps. cxlvii. 17.

ⁿ Gen. viii. 22.

into sin. God has let us go on our own way, and now out of our own way He is bringing, in an opposite direction from heretofore, fresh, and it seems bitterer, trial upon us; but if we abide it, thereby not a cure only for our ills, but a means of glory. How we are to act, may He give those who have the guidance of things, the wisdom to discern; but for ourselves, the lesson of the Revolution comes with great force upon us, to beware of impatience, lest it tempt us into sin, and to look to the end. It may be that, as in Israel of old, the tale of the bricks was laid upon them, and yet no straw given, and "the people were scattered throughout all the land of Egypt, to gather stubble instead of straw, and the officers were beaten, and God for a time "delivered" not His people at all," but rather commenced their deliverance by increasing their troubles, so it may be now; we are to look that it should be so; and take with us the example of His people, which He so often sets forth in His later prophets as the emblem of His deliverances, and wait till He shew forth His power and accomplish His ends. States have seldom done this, and so have fallen from one destruction to another and finally perished; they would deliver themselves, and so have fallen; the Church waited patiently for Him, and so He saith^v, "I removed his shoulder from the burthen; his hands were delivered from making the pots; thou calledst upon me in trouble, and I delivered thee; I answered thee in the secret place of thunder." The book of Psalms lays open the interior history of God's dealings; and sometimes recording, but more frequently stripping off, all the outward circumstances, exhibits to us the secret springs, or leads us into the inmost sanctuary of God; and there is no instruction, which it more frequently impresses on those who will hear, than this, or rather this is the uniform tenor of its teaching, that

^v Ex. v. 23.

^p Ps. lxxxi. 6, 7.

“the enemy assails, man prays, God delivereth.” The Psalms know of no other course of events, which shall end well, than this, and so fills up the teaching of the sacred history, that where He acts by human means it is He who acteth; that He delivereth His people by raising up Moses among them, or Cyrus, a heathen from a far country; that He delivereth St. Stephen to the Jews, or St. James to the Gentiles, or rescueth St. Peter, or changes Saul the blasphemer and persecutor into Paul the Apostle and prisoner of Jesus Christ: and the combined lesson is, that knowing all things, and so the interests of our own Church too, to be in His hands, we should be content to leave them there, and not by hastily taking them into our own, or confiding them to man, provoke Him to leave us to ourselves and our own wisdom. To impress this upon one important audience was the object of the Sermon, not any temporary end. “It is better to trust in the Lord than to put any confidence in man.” “Some trust in chariots, and some in horses, but we will remember the name of the Lord our God. They are brought down and fallen, but we are risen and stand upright.”

Martyrdom of King Charles I.

APPENDIX III.

OXFORD DECREE OF 1683.

The "Oxford Decree" of 1683 is here reprinted, both because persons have a very vague notion about it, as something containing certain ultra doctrines about government, instead of being, as it is, a careful and thoughtful document, and in order to shew in what company certain maxims, now commonly received, are found, and from what sort of persons they proceed. Collyer^a says, that "most of the authors from whom the propositions were extracted, had either acted in or abetted the late rebellion. The Decree was drawn up in Latin by the [Regius] Professor in Divinity [Dr. Jane], passed the Convocation on Saturday, July 21, and presented to H. M. in English on the 24th." Both the English and Latin consequently are authentic copies.

The Address from the University of Cambridge, about the same time, contains altogether the same doctrine, though not enunciated in the same formal way. It says^b,

"No earthly power, we hope, no menaces or misery, shall ever be able to make us renounce or forget our duty. We will

^a ii. 902.

^b ib. 905.

still believe and maintain that our princes derive not their title from the people, but from God^c; that to Him only they are accountable^d; that it belongs not to subjects either to create or censure, but to honour and obey their Sovereign^e, who comes to be so, by a fundamental hereditary^f right of succession, which no religion, no law, no fault, no forfeiture, can alter or diminish^g.

The Oxford Decree having been "given^h in evidence by Dr. Sacheverel at his trial, and reprinted in a book or pamphlet entitled an entire confutation of Mr. Hoadley's book on the original of government, taken from the London Gazette, published by authority, London, reprinted in the year 1710," was, by the Whig majority, which condemned Dr. Sacheverel, ordered to be burnt together with his Sermons. It was condemned as containing "several positions, contrary to the constitution of this kingdom, and destructive to the Protestant succession, as by law established." The reprint, rather than the Decree itself, probably was condemned, since the Decree of 1683 was not contrary to the then constitution, but only to that of 1688, so that it could only be condemned, as

^c Prop. 1. Oxf.

^d Prop. 3. Oxf.

^e Prop. 2. Oxf.

^f Prop. 4. Oxf.

^g Prop. 2. Oxf.

^h Lords' Journals, 23 Martii, 1709. At the same time, a printer was attached for printing Dr. Sacheverel's speech and several other parts of the trial.

itself condemning by anticipation what afterwards took place. Only four Bishops were present on this occasion. The grounds alleged apply especially to the second, third, fourth, and fifth propositions, so that the Whig Peers, by no unusual combination of extremes, joined themselves with the individuals, whose maxims were there condemned, *i. e.* Romanists as well as Presbyterians and Republicans.

“Those,” says Bp. Collyer¹, “who blame these gentle-

¹ *Ib.* p. 903. No topic has been more employed against these principles, as an inconsistency imputed to those who upheld them. The Romanist Lingard as well as the infidel Hume seem to have a delight in exposing this alleged failure of principles in the hour of trial. Lingard says on this Decree, (xiii. 341.) “Five years did not elapse before the framers of this Decree were called upon to practise the doctrine which it taught. They felt its inconvenience: ‘the badge and character of the Church of England’ were thrown away; and the *University* made a present of its plate to the invader, who sought to deprive the reigning sovereign of his Crown.” In like way, Hume, (c. 71.) “The Prince’s Declaration was read at Oxford by the Duke of Ormond, and was received with great applause by that loyal *University*, who also made an offer of their plate to the Prince.” Yet Burnet, the Whig historian, who was present, names only *one Head of a College*, who in the name of *some* others made such an offer. “At Crookhorn, Dr. Finch, son to the Earl of Winchelsea, then made Warden of All Souls College in Oxford, was sent to the Prince from some of the Heads of Colleges, assuring him that they would declare for him, and inviting him to come thither, telling him that their plate should be at his service if he needed it. This was a sudden turn from those principles that they had carried so high a few years before.” *Own Times*, v. fin. So then from an historian who would be inclined to make the most of the inconsistency, we have—not the *University*—not the Colleges—not even most or all the Heads of Colleges, but only *some* unnamed *Heads*, represented by one who seems to have been an officious forward person. The *University* remained what it had been, loyal to the sovereign set over them, even though ill-treated by him, and for this adherence they are taunted under the name of Jacobitism. One charge destroys the other. They, who remained

men of the University, as if they set the obedience of the subject too high, do not seem to have fully considered, that the Homilies and Statutes make submission to the Crown no less absolute, the passive chain altogether as heavy, and strike the resisting principle as strong, as any inference which can be drawn from the Oxford Decree." 13, 14 Car. II. c. 3. 13 Car. II. c. 6. 14 Car. II. c. 6. 25 Ed. III. c. 2. 14 Car. II. c. 4. Homil. X. Exhortation to Obedience. Homil. XXXIII. against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion.

The Decree is here printed as it appeared in the Gazette, which is a free translation of the Latin, but is, as was said, also authentic.

Whitehall, July 24, 1683.

This day was presented to his Majesty the following Judgment and Decree of the University of Oxford, passed in their Convocation, on Saturday the 21st instant.

The Judgment and Decree of the University of Oxford, passed in their Convocation, July 21, 1683, against certain pernicious books, and damnable doctrines, destructive to the sacred persons of princes, their state and government, and of all human society.

ALTHOUGH the barbarous assassination lately enterprised against the person of his sacred Majesty, and his royal brother, engage all our thoughts, to reflect with utmost

Jacobites when there was nothing to hope from the exiled king, are not likely to have been the first to have "declared for the invader." Without justifying the particular "Heads," it should be recollected that beyond that time, it was hoped by many, even by Archbishop Sancroft, that the Prince came as a mediator, not as an invader.

detestation and abhorrence on that execrable villany, hateful to God and man ; and pay our due acknowledgments to the Divine Providence, which by extraordinary methods brought it to pass, that “ the breath of our nostrils, the anointed of the Lord, is” not “ taken in the pit” which was prepared for him, and that under his shadow we continue to live and enjoy the blessings of his government ; yet notwithstanding we find it to be a necessary duty at this time, to search into, and lay open, those impious doctrines, which having of late been studiously disseminated, gave rise and growth to these nefarious attempts, and pass upon them our solemn public censure and decree of condemnation.

Therefore to the honour of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, the preservation of Catholic truth in the Church ; and that the King’s majesty may be secured both from the attempts of open bloody enemies, and machinations of treacherous heretics and schismatics : We, the Vice-Chancellor, Doctors, Proctors, and Masters Regent and Not Regent, met in Convocation, in the accustomed manner, time, and place, on Saturday, the One and Twentieth Day of July, in the Year One Thousand Six Hundred and Eighty-three, concerning certain Propositions contained in divers books and writings, published in the English, and also the Latin tongue, repugnant to the Holy Scriptures, Decrees of Councils, writings of the Fathers, the faith and profession of the primitive Church ; and also destructive of the kingly government, the safety of his Majesty’s person, the public peace, the laws of nature, and bonds of human society, by our unanimous assent and consent, have decreed and determined in manner and form following.

The First Proposition.

All civil authority is derived originally from the people.

The Second.

There is a mutual compact, tacit or express, between a prince and his subjects; and that if he perform not his duty, they are discharged from theirs.

The Third.

That if lawful governors become tyrants, or govern otherwise than by the laws of God and man they ought to do, they forfeit the right they had unto their government. *Lex Rex.*^a *Buchanan*^b *de Jure Regni Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos.* *Bellarmino de Conciliis et Pontifice.* *Dolman*^c, *Milton*, *Goodwin*^d, *Baxter's H. C.*

^a *Lex, Rex: the Law and the prince, a dispute for the just prerogative of King and People, containing the reasons and causes of the most necessary Defensive Wars of the Kingdom of Scotland, and of their expedition for the aid and help of their dear brethren of England. . . . Published by authority, Lond. 1644, 4to.* "The authors of "*Lex Rex*" "*Jus populi vindicatum*" and others were known to have written these libels from pique against the Government, because they justly suffered under it." Sir G. Mackenzie *Just right of Monarchy*, p. 6.

^b "It is undeniable that Buchanan wrote this book" *de Jure regni* "to persuade Scotland to raise his patron, though a bastard, to the crown." Mackenzie, *ib.* "it is condemned as slanderous, and containing several offensive matters by the 124 Act. Parl. 8. Jas. VI. A. 1584, which was the first Parliament that ever sate after his book was printed." *Id.* p. 8.

^c "In the year 1594 Parsons the Jesuit or (as Mr. Camden says) he, Cardinal Allen, and Sir F. Inglefield under the name of *R. Doleman*, wrote a book entitled "a conference about the next succession to the crown of England," divided into two parts. The first, pretended to have been the discourse of a civil Lawyer, concerning succession by proximity of blood in general, contains, for the most part, in nine chapters, the very principles of sedition and rebellion; proved and maintained, (as is there also pretended,) by examples and texts of Holy Scripture; examples in France, Spain, Germany, England, and other nations. The English examples and instances, generally, are partially cited, or mis-applied, or not fully understood by the author.—In the year 1648, as a preparative to the deposition and murder of King Charles the first, there was published a pamphlet, and printed at London by Robert Ibbitson, under the title of "several speeches,

The Fourth.

The sovereignty of England is in the three estates, *viz.* King, Lords, and Commons. The King has but a co-ordinate power, and may be overruled by the other two. *Lex Rex. Hunton, of a Limited and Mixed Monarchy*^e. *Baxter's H. C.' Polit. Catechis.*

The Fifth.

Birth-right and proximity of blood, give no title to rule or government; and it is lawful to preclude the next heir from his right and succession to the crown. *Lex Rex. Hunt's*

delivered at a conference concerning the power of parliaments to proceed against their king for misgovernment:" and the heads in the title page, upon which these speeches are pretended to be made, are in number nine, and the very same, verbatim, with the titles of Doleman's nine chapters in his first part of the "conference touching the succession to the crown:" and the matter and words of the speeches themselves, almost in all things, are the very same, except the transitions, connections, and some few, not material passages, which are left out. From these conferences of Doleman, which by crafty men were published by retail, in several Pamphlets, speeches, declarations, pernicious deductions, &c. and from the nine speeches last mentioned, all the factious in the late times of rebellion, were furnished with arguments, reasons, examples and pretences for their seditious practices. And the suggestions of the act for the trial of King Charles the first, and the materials of the long speech Bradshaw made, to declare the grounds of the sentence, and aggravate the things laid to his charge, by mis-applying both law and history, were borrowed from these books: as likewise was much of the most seditious part of Milton's book, entitled, "the defence for the people of England." Also in the year 1655 at London, was printed an abstract of Parsons' book containing the substance, and often the words of it." True and Exact History of the Succession—written for the information of such as have been seduced by the "brief history of the succession," p. 1, 2. [Christ Church Pamphlets, 4. C. 17.]

^d "Goodwin, Joh. one of the most violent of the Republican Sectaries in the time of Charles I. was born 1593, died 1665." Watt. Bibl. Brit.

^e A Treatise of Monarchy in two parts; concerning Monarchy in general, and concerning this particular Monarchy. 1643, 4to.

^f Holy Commonwealth, or Political Aphorisms, opening the true principles of Government. Lond. 1659, 12mo.

Postscript^g. *Dolman. History of Succession*^h. *Julian*ⁱ *the Apostate. Mene Tehel.*

The Sixth.

It is lawful for subjects without the consent, and against the command of the supreme magistrate, to enter into leagues, covenants, and associations, for defence of themselves and their religion. *Solemn League and Covenant. Late Association*^k.

The Seventh.

Self-preservation is the fundamental law of nature, and

^g Argument for the Bishops right with the Postscript, and two Discourses about the Succession and Bill of Exclusion. London, 1682, 8vo.

^h "A brief history of the Succession, collected out of the records and most authentic historians for the satisfaction of the Earl of H." "Much of the materials of this pamphlet, and most of the history contained in it, are taken out of the Jesuit's [Parsons'] book, the speeches and conferences before-mentioned." (see above, p. 145, not. d.) True and Exact Hist. (a learned refutation of it, exposing its dishonesty,) p. 2.

ⁱ A libel written against James towards the end of the reign of Charles II. by Sam. Johnson.

^k For the exclusion and banishment of James II. when Duke of York, "The paper was seized in the Earl of Shaftsbury's Closet by Fran. Gwin, Esq. one of the Clerks of H. M. most Hon. Privy Council, and read Nov. 24, 1681, at the Old Baily before H. M. Commissioners of Oyer and Terminer." It exists in a Pamphlet entitled, "The Two Associations one subscribed by 156 Members of the H. of C. 1643. The other seized in the Closet of the Earl of Shaftsbury, London, 1681." [Among the Atterbury Pamphlets in Christ Church, 5. B. 10.] Those who entered it, did "in the presence of God solemnly promise and vow" that they would "never consent that the said James Duke of York, or any other, who is, or hath been a Papist, or any ways adhered to the Papists in their wicked designs, be admitted to the succession of the Crown of England. But by all lawful means, and by force of arms if need so require, according to my abilities, will oppose him, and endeavour to subdue, expel and destroy him, if he come into England or the dominions thereof and seek by force to set up his pretended title," also "that with our joint and particular forces we will oppose and pursue unto destruction all such as upon any title whatsoever shall oppose the just and righteous ends of this association." *Ib.* p. 4, 5.

supersedes the obligation of all others, whensoever they stand in competition with it. *Hobb's De Cive. Leviathan.*

The Eighth.

The doctrine of the Gospel concerning patient suffering of injuries, is not inconsistent with violent resisting of the higher power in case of persecution for religion. *Lex Rex. Julian Apostate. Apolog. Relat.*¹

The Ninth.

There lies no obligation upon Christians to passive obedience, when the prince commands any thing against the laws of our country; and the primitive Christians chose rather to die than resist, because Christianity was not settled by the laws of the empire. *Julian Apostate.*

The Tenth.

Possession and strength give a right to govern^a; and success in a cause or enterprise, proclaims it to be lawful and just: to pursue it, is to comply with the will of God, because it is to follow the conduct of His Providence. ^a*Hobbe's.* ^b*Owen's Sermon before the Regicides, Jan. 31, 1648.* *Baxter. Jenken's Petition*^m, Oct. 1651.

The Eleventh.

In the state of nature, there is no difference between good and evil, right and wrong; the state of nature is a state of war, in which every man hath a right to all things.

The Twelfth.

The foundation of civil authority is this natural right, which is not given, but left to the supreme magistrate upon

¹ "An apologetical Narration, humbly submitted to the Hon. Houses of Parliament, by Thomas Goodwin, Philip Nye, William Bridge, Jer. Burroughes, Sidrach Simpson." Lond. 1643. Also entitled, "An apologetical Narration of some Ministers, formerly in exile, now members of the assembly of Divines." [Christ Church Pamphlets, B. 129.]

^m "Certain Conscientious Queries of Mr. William Jenken, being the grounds of his late Petition and Submission to the present power, 1651, whereunto is annexed his Petition, still very much desired."

men's entering into societies; and not only a foreign invader, but a domestic rebel, puts himself again into state of nature, to be proceeded against, not as a subject, but an enemy, and consequently acquires by his rebellion the same right over the life of his prince, as the prince for the most heinous crimes has over the life of his own subjects.

The Thirteenth.

Every man after his entering into a society, retains a right of defending himself against force, and cannot transfer that right to the Commonwealth, when he consents to that union, whereby a Commonwealth is made; and in case a great many men together have already resisted the Commonwealth, for which every one of them expecteth death, they have liberty then to join together or to assist and defend one another. Their bearing of arms subsequent to the first breach of their duty, though it be to maintain what they have done, is no new unjust act, and if it be only to defend their persons, is not unjust at all.

The Fourteenth.

An oath superadds no obligation to pact, and a pact obliges no farther than it is credited, and consequently if a prince gives any indication that he does not believe the promises of fealty and allegiance made by any of his subjects, they are thereby freed from their subjection, and notwithstanding their pacts and oaths, may lawfully rebel against and destroy their sovereign. *Hobbs, de Cive. Leviathan.*

The Fifteenth.

If a people that by oath and duty are obliged to a sovereign shall sinfully dispossess him, and, contrary to their covenants, choose and covenant with another, they may be obliged by their later covenants, notwithstanding their former. *Baxter H. C.*

The Sixteenth.

All oaths are unlawful, and contrary to the word of God.
Quaker.

The Seventeenth.

An oath obligeth not in the sense of the imposer, but the taker's. *Sheriff's Case.*

The Eighteenth.

Dominion is founded in grace.

The Nineteenth.

The powers of this world are usurpations upon the prerogative of Jesus Christ; and it is the duty of God's people to destroy them, in order to the setting Christ upon His throne. *Fifth-Monarchy-Men.*

The Twentieth.

The presbyterian government is the sceptre of Christ's kingdom, to which kings as well as others are bound to submit; and the king's supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs, asserted by the Church of England, is injurious to Christ, the sole King and Head of His Church. *Altare Damascenum*ⁿ.
Apolog. Relat. Hist. Indulg. Cartwright^o. *Travers*^o.

The Twenty-first.

It is not lawful for superiors to impose any thing in the worship of God that is not antecedently necessary.

The Twenty-second.

The duty of not offending a weak brother, is inconsistent with all human authority of making laws concerning indifferent things. *Protestant Reconciler*^p.

ⁿ The author was David Calderwood, a learned Presbyterian writer. It was published under the name (formed from his own by transposition) of Edwardus Didoclavius. It contains a bitter attack on Episcopacy and the English Liturgy. The author had been banished in 1618, published the *Alt. Dam.* in Holland, A. 1623, and returned to Scotland 1637, (a little before the formation of the Covenant.) Pref. to the A. D.

^o Hooker's Puritan Opponents.

^p "Protestant Reconciler, humbly pleading for condescension to dis-

The Twenty-third.

Wicked kings and tyrants ought to be put to death; and if the judges and inferior magistrates will not do their office, the power of the sword devolves to the people; if the major part of the people refuse to exercise this power, then the ministers may excommunicate such a king; after which it is lawful for any of the subjects to kill him; as the people did Athaliah, and Jehu Jezabel. *Buchanan. Knox. Goodman^a. Gilby^r. Jesuits.*

The Twenty-fourth.

After the sealing of the Scripture canon, the people of God in all ages are to expect new revelations for a rule of their actions^s; and it is lawful for a private man, having an inward motion from God, to kill a tyrant^b. ^a *Quakers and other enthusiasts.* ^b *Goodman.*

The Twenty-fifth.

The example of Phineas is to us instead of a command;

sending brethren in things indifferent, and unnecessary for the sake of peace, and shewing how unreasonable it is to make such things the necessary conditions of Communion. By a Well-wisher to the Church's peace and a lamenter of her sad divisions." [Dan. Whitby, D. D.] 1682, 3. In the same year, Dr. Whitby signed a recantation prepared for him by S. Ward, Bishop of Salisbury, wherein he expressed his "true and hearty sorrow for having, through want of prudence and deference to authority, caused it to be printed and published, for any evil influence it hath had upon the dissenters;"—that "whereas it containeth several passages, which I am convinced in my conscience are obnoxious to the Canons, and do reflect upon the governors of the said Church, I do openly revoke and renounce all irreverent and unmeet expressions contained therein." The specific "propositions" here condemned, he "openly renounced, being false, erroneous, and schismatical, and revoked and disclaimed all tenets, positions, and assertions contained in the same book, from whence these positions can be inferred." ap. Sykes "short account of Dr. Whitby." He died 1726, an Arian.

^s "A noted Puritan, and classed among the Reformers of Religion in Scotland, was born at Chester, 1520, died 1601 or 2." Watt. *Bibl. Brit.*

^r Ant. Gilby, a Scotch writer, contemporary with John Knox.

for what God hath commanded or approved in one age, must needs oblige in all. *Goodman. Knox. Naphtali*.*

The Twenty-sixth.

King Charles the First was lawfully put to death, and his murderers were the blessed instruments of God's glory in their generation. *Milton. Goodwin. Owen.*

The Twenty-seventh.

King Charles the First made war upon his parliament, and in such a case the king may not only be resisted, but he ceaseth to be king. *Baxter.*

We decree, judge, and declare all and every of these propositions to be false, seditious, and impious, and most of them to be also heretical and blasphemous, infamous to Christian religion, and destructive of all government in Church and State.

We farther decree, That the books which contain the aforesaid propositions and impious doctrines, are fitted to deprave good manners, corrupt the minds of unwary men, stir up seditions and tumults, overthrow states and kingdoms, and lead to rebellion, murder of princes, and atheism itself: and therefore we interdict all Members of the University from the reading of the said books, under the penalties in the Statutes expressed. We also order the before-recited books to be publicly burnt by the hand of our Marshal, in the Court of our Schools.

* "Naphtali, or the Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland; with the testimonies of some who have died for the Truth since the year 1660;" ascribed to Sir James Stewart or Stuart, of Goodtrees Bt., Solicitor-General for Scotland, and Mr. Js. Stirling, Minister of Paisley. Sir J. S. wrote in its defence in 1699, "Jus Populi Vindicatum, or the People's right to defend themselves and their covenanted Religion, vindicated: being a Reply to the first part of the Survey of Naphtali." sc. "A Survey of the insolent and infamous Libel, entituled Naphtali; by Andrew Honyman, Bp. of Orkney." Edinb. 1668. 2 parts, 4to. [Watt.]

Likewise we order, That in perpetual memory hereof, these our decrees shall be entered into the registry of our Convocation : and that copies of them being communicated to the several Colleges and Halls within this University, they be there publicly affixed in the Libraries, Refectories, or other fit places, where they may be seen and heard of all.

Lastly, We command and strictly enjoin all and singular the readers, tutors, catechists, and others, to whom the care and trust of institution of youth is committed, that they diligently instruct and ground their scholars in that most necessary doctrine, which in a manner is the badge and character of the Church of England, " Of submitting to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto governors as unto them that are sent by Him, for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well." Teaching that this submission and obedience is to be clear, absolute, and without exception of any state or order of men. Also that they, according to the Apostle's precept, exhort, " That first of all supplications, prayer, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men, for the King, and all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty, for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour." And in especial manner that they press and oblige them humbly to offer their most ardent and daily prayers to the throne of grace, for the preservation of our Sovereign Lord King Charles, from the attempts of open violence and secret machinations of perfidious traitors ; that the Defender of the Faith, being safe under the defence of the Most High, may continue his reign on earth, till he exchange it for that of a late and happy immortality.

For many of the references in this Appendix, the author has to thank the kind pains of the Rev. B. Bandinel, D.D. Bodley's Librarian.

A

LETTER

TO THE RIGHT REV. FATHER IN GOD,

RICHARD

LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD,

ON THE

TENDENCY TO ROMANISM

IMPUTED TO

DOCTRINES HELD OF OLD, AS NOW, IN THE

ENGLISH CHURCH.

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE;

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH.

OXFORD:

J. H. PARKER:

J. G. & F. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

1839.

“ To say that in nothing they may be followed which are of the Church of Rome were violent and extreme. Some things they do in that they are men, in that they are wise men and Christian men some things, some things in that they are men misled and blinded with error. As far as they follow reason and truth, we fear not to tread the selfsame steps wherein they have gone, and be their followers. Where Rome keepeth that which is ancients and better, others whom we much more affect; leaving it for newer and changing it for worse; we had rather follow the perfections of them whom we like not, than in defects resemble those whom we love.”

HOOKE, Book V. ch. xxviii. sect. 1.

“ They which measure religion by dislike of the church of Rome, think every man so much the more sound, by how much he can make the corruptions thereof to seem more large Wisdom therefore and skill is requisite to know, what parts are sound in that Church and what corrupted.

“ Neither is it to all men apparent which complain of unsound parts, with what kind of unsoundness every such part is possessed. They can say, that in doctrine, in discipline, in prayers, in sacraments, the Church of Rome bath (as it hath indeed) very foul and gross corruptions; the nature whereof, notwithstanding, because they have not for the most part exact skill and knowledge to discern, they think that amiss many times which is not; and the salve of reformation they mightily call for, but where and what the sores are which need it, as they wot full little, so they think it not greatly material to search.”

HOOKE, Book IV. ch. viii. sect. 2.

A

LETTER,

&c.

MY DEAR LORD,

IN ordinary times it is best and simplest to be silent amidst misrepresentations, and to commit our innocence to GOD, leaving it to Him to bring it out when to Him seems good ; “ As for me, I was like a deaf man and heard not, and as one that is dumb, who doth not open his mouth ; I became even as a man that heareth not, and in whose mouth are no re-proofs : for in Thee, O Lord, have I put my trust ; “ Thou shalt answer for me, O Lord my God ¹.” Extensive good to the many must always be purchased by the suffering of the few ; it is a portion of the Cross which our LORD has bequeathed as a precious gift to His disciples, and they must take it humbly and thankfully ; glad if they may indeed think that they have a portion of it, yet scarce venturing to decide for themselves whether it be in truth His Cross, or the chastisement of their own

¹ Ps. xxxviii. 13—15.

infirmities, yet taking it at all events quietly and joyously, that so, sanctified by that meritorious Cross, it may turn to their joy and consolation; and to those, to whom it is indeed His Cross, to their crown.

These, however, are not ordinary times; the waters, which stagnated during the last century, are being stirred vehemently; we trust, for the health of those who shall be cast into them; but amid the first troubling, people seem to be tossed this way and that, not knowing whither themselves shall be borne, and more curious about the fate of others, than anxious to secure their own. It is not among the least strange circumstances of the times, that tracts, written for a temporary purpose, by persons unknown, or those who were known, but little known beyond their own University, should within a few years have been made, against the will of their writers, into a sort of touch-stone of opinion almost throughout the land; it is stranger yet, that the greater part of those who make these tracts a test of soundness or unsoundness of faith, should be ready to confess not even to have seen them, but have gleaned what little they know of them from the report of one or two periodicals; stranger yet, that publications devoted to politics, should at a time of great political expectation, break off their speculations, or books of gossip¹ “cut off their tale, to

¹ “Travels in Town.”

talk of " deep and sacred subjects of theology, and descant on the gifts of God in Baptism, or on the succession of Bishops ; or a defence of the Establishment ¹ be changed into an " accuser of its brethren." Amid this chaos, it is certainly *not* strange, that the wildest misconceptions should be commonly circulated and greedily received ; that tales about the writers in the " Tracts for the Times" should take the place of other novelties, and that those who live to " tell or to hear some new thing," should be more interested in their novelty than their truth ; or that truths which were handed down to us by our forefathers, and which in the last century, and in the beginning of the present, were held by the majority of the Clergy, should be stigmatized as novelties, because new to such as have taken their opinions from a modern school.

This ferment has already had its use ; the names of individuals have been branded, but the doctrines or practices which they recommended have been at least partially received. Many who opposed them, were obliged to advance a certain way, in order to take a position from which they might with advantage attack them : still more frequently, men were thus constrained to consider subjects which they had hitherto left out of sight, but which, once brought before them, demanded an audience, and thereon found admittance, through their manifest coincidence

¹ " Essays on the Church," originally, and still for the most part, an useful exposure of the pseudo-voluntary system.

with the teaching or the services of our Church. Thus, many observe the Ember weeks, acknowledge in some degree the duty of fasting, keep some of the festivals of the Church, acknowledge the privileges of their Ministry, are thankful for the gifts of GOD in their Baptism, have truer views of repentance, recognize the benefits of more frequent Communion, not to speak now of a deeper knowledge of its blessedness, who perhaps little suspect from what quarter they derived their present views. Doubtless too some of those who now have "heresy" upon their lips, have been awakened from their apathy as to its dangers, ultimately, by those whom they now accuse of it; and some have derived unconsciously their value for the distinctive character of their Apostolic Church from those, whom they now too readily suppose to be alienated from, or but lukewarm towards, her. Then also these discussions, though often somewhat rudely and painfully carried on, have spread wide the seed; and so it has reached and lodged in many a heart, which GOD has prepared to receive it, and to which He has thus brought it, and is taking root and bringing forth fruit of self-denial, self-discipline, increased devotion, and enlarged charity. We can, in another respect, already, hardly realize the state in which we were some few years ago. The plans of reforming our Liturgy, then so rife (each reformer having a scheme of his own, and agreeing with his fellows only in curtailing¹ the

¹ This, as so much besides, is inherited from the Puritans. See

whole), have shrunk away, or sunk to rest; most have discovered that one hour and an half in a week is but very little to offer to Almighty God: the murmurs against the Athanasian Creed and the imprecatory Psalms, are no longer heard: and those who retain their wishes for some alteration, are content to abandon it for the time as hopeless, and to comfort themselves, that if the Liturgy were more perfect, "the sort of idolatry now often offered to it"¹ would be increased, and it might be "placed not only on a level with the Bible, which indeed men often do already, but even above it." Thus the Church has gained a respite; and persons, who love her, might the more cheerfully go on with the task of studying her character, and developing it in their own practice, and inculcating it on their flocks.

And with this we should have been contented, had we ourselves, or our own character, alone been concerned. Each year is changing or modifying the opinions of numbers among those, who once regarded as novelties the truths which we have put forth in the name of our Church: many now support them, who once opposed them; and of those who have been too long trained in a different system to receive any new impressions, many yet see thus much, that there is nothing in these views inconsistent with piety; and so they are content to wait with Gamaliel, to see

Hooker's Defence of the length of the Church Service, Eccl. Pol. V. xxxii. and notes, ed. Keble.

¹ Essays on the Church, p. 270.

whither this thing would grow, "for if this counsel
 "or this work be of men, it will come to nought;
 "but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest
 "haply ye be found to fight against God."

The case, however, is altered since your Lordship, as our diocesan, has, in the discharge of your sacred office¹, pronounced upon the charges circulated against us; acquitting those among us who are parochial ministers, of any "breach of discipline," and bestowing a refreshing and paternal praise, which we gratefully acknowledge at your Lordship's hands, for our "desire to restore the discipline of the Church," our "attempts to secure a stricter attention to the Rubrical directions in the Book of Common Prayer, and to restore the due observance of the fasts and festivals of the Church:" and on other topics, although your Lordship declines entering into questions, which "might hereafter tend to controversial discussions," (since your Lordship's office is to pronounce and arbitrate, not to dispute with those over whom you are placed in the LORD) your Lordship has kindly stated that "the authors of the Tracts have not laid upon your Lordship the painful necessity of interfering, nor have you any fear that we shall ever do so." And thus, while we thankfully acknowledge the caution which your Lordship gives, especially to those who have learnt of us, (since in times of excitement

¹ Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford, 1838, pp. 20, 21.

there must always be reason to fear lest the truth should be evil spoken of, through the exaggerations of those who receive it,) we feel ourselves acquitted, not of human infirmity, but of having put forth any such doctrine, or in such spirit, as would call for the admonitions of those who have authority in the LORD'S vineyard.

But this acquittal by your Lordship, calculated in itself to inspire confidence in the members of the Church, and to procure us peace, has proved only contemporaneous, at least, with yet more violent and more extended censure. Even your Lordship's name and office has not been spared, simply for having acquitted us¹; many seem to be perplexed, as if there must be some evil about the thing, of which there is so much evil spoken; as the chief captain commanded to examine St. Paul "with scourging, that he might know wherefore they cried so against him." Acts xxii. 24.

In reverence then to your Lordship's office, I would endeavour at least, to show those who *will* see, that we were not undeserving of your Lordship's kindness; both lest your Lordship's holy office (for personally your Lordship would be unconcerned) should in the eyes of any be compromised; and in hopes of restoring in some measure that spirit of concord, which your Lordship would promote; for which we pray; and which we very sensibly need, now that

¹ Church of England Review, reprinted in the Times newspaper.

Romanist and Ultra-Protestant are united in an unnatural league against our Church. And in so doing, I would beg respectfully to be understood, not to claim the sanction of your Lordship's authority in behalf of all the views which I profess. In some indeed, and in those affecting the most important questions, I feel assured that I coincide with your Lordship, as having learnt them from the same Mother, the Church of England; others, upon which she has not pronounced, I would claim only to fall within the scope of your Lordship's words: "There must always be allowable points of difference in the opinions of good men; and it is only when such opinions are carried into extremes, or are mooted in a spirit which tends to schism, that the interference of those in authority in the Church is called for."

The charges brought against us are heavy, disaffection to our own Church, unfaithfulness to her teaching, a desire to bring in new doctrines, and to conform our Church more to the Church of Rome, to bring back either entire or "modified Popery."

The evidence for these charges is somewhat vague: for ultra-Protestantism has in its own nature no standard except each man's private judgment, and so its notions of Popery vary according to each man's individual views; and that becomes to every one Popish, which in solemnity of observance is greater than his own, or a doctrine, or rite of Antiquity which he holds not. Time was, when the use of the surplice, the cross in Baptism, the very use of the LORD'S

prayer in the same part of the service which it occupied in the ancient ritual, to bow at the name of our LORD, to stand during the reading of the Gospel, to administer confirmation, to “turn his face “at any time from the people¹, or before service “ended, remove from the place where it was begun,” and the like, were accounted Popish by those of the “extreme reformation,” whose principle it was that “in nothing they may be followed which are of the “Church of Rome².” Whither that principle leads, our Church has once had but too unhappy experience. But the principle, although modified, is not abandoned; it is not now Popish to bow at the name of our LORD in the Creed, but it *is* Popish to do so at any other time; the Cross in Baptism is not Popish, but for any, privately, to retrace that mark upon himself, though a practice of the early Church, is Popish; to baptize infants is not Popish, but to hold that all infants derive benefit from Baptism is altogether Popery; to bow to the Altar where such (as in some cathedrals) is the received custom, is not Popish, but to speak of it with respect is so; the title “Altar,” is not Popish in the coronation-service, because it is part of the ritual of our Church; but, (though a scriptural and primitive title) used by any private Clergyman, it is an indication of Popery³: to kneel towards the east, is not Popish in a Cathedral, or in the Ord-

Hooker Eccl. Pol. V. xxx. beg.

² Hooker E. P. V. xxviii. beg.

³ Essays on the Church, p. 290. Fraser’s Answer to Dr. Hook’s Call to Union, p. 8.

⁴ Essays, p. 287. Fraser, p. 21.

nation-service by a Bishop, but in a Priest (although no innovation) it is so ; again, it was not so accounted in Hooker's time, in the Church, but that has become Popish in the 19th, which was not in the 17th ; it is *not* Popish, if any one, taking one alternative offered him by his Church ¹, "all Priests and Deacons are to say daily the morning and evening Prayer, *either privately, or openly*, not being let by sickness or some other urgent cause," shall say them by himself in his own house ; but if any one, taking the alternative *enjoined* to the Parochial Minister unless "reasonably hindered, say the same in the Parish Church or Chapel, where he ministereth," and from any cause none come to "pray with him," then to pray by himself in the Church *is* Popish, and partakes of the nature of "private masses."

Again, it implies a Papistical leaning to dislike the term "Protestant²." And yet this title, the rejection of which is to argue a leaning to Romanism, does not belong historically to our Church, but to the Lutherans, and was still used exclusively of them, in the memory of some of the younger among us ; it has no where been adopted by our Church in any formulary or document of her's ; nay, it was in 1689 altogether repudiated by the representatives of the inferior Clergy at least, the Lower house of Convocation ³, who would not even

¹ Directions "Concerning the Service of the Church," in Preface to Common Prayer-book.

² Essays on the Church, p. 284.

³ Birch's Life of Tillotson. See at length, Tracts, No. 71, p. 33

allow of the phrase, "The Protestant religion in general, and the Church of England in particular," lest they should thereby seem in any way to identify themselves with the foreign Churches. Thus then, again, that is to be Papistical in the beginning of the 19th century, which was not at the close of the 17th; or the main body of our Clergy had then a Papistical leaning. The adoption of a Lutheran title might surely better prove those who use it, to identify themselves with the Lutherans, than its rejection to imply any lurking feeling for the Church of Rome. The title, as simply negative, is ill-fitted to characterize the faith of any portion of the Christian Church; it speaks only of what we do not hold, not of what we do hold, and is accordingly in some countries, as Italy, adopted by those who intend thereby to deny, not the errors only held by Rome, but the Faith which she has retained: "which imagine the canker to have eaten so far into the very bones and marrow of the Church of Rome, as if it had not so much as a sound belief, no, not concerning God Himself, but that the very belief of the Trinity were a part of Anti-Christian corruption¹." For the most part, Protestant is there the title assumed by the infidel. And this abuse of the title lies in its very nature; it is always more real to describe ourselves by what we are, than to state merely what we are not, lest in time our faith should shrink into the mere denial of error, instead of being a confession of the truth.

¹ Hooker E. P. IV. viii. 2. ed. Keble.

It is Popery again, and disaffection to our Church, to doubt whether the Pope is *the* Antichrist, even while asserting that there is much anti-Christian¹ in the system of Rome; that as in St. John's time there were "many Antichrists," and the mystery of iniquity had begun already to work in St. Paul's, and his descriptions were in great degree realized by the Gnostic heresies, so there is also anti-Christianism *in* the system of Rome, though Antichrist himself be not yet revealed, nor may we yet know when or among whom he will appear.

Again, to approve of any thing in the Roman Breviary, which was not extracted thence by the reformers of our Liturgy, betrays a longing, they say, towards Rome, an argument somewhat singular in their mouths, who speak against the "idolatry of the Prayer-book,"—as if our compilers had been not only wisely governed, but infallibly directed, and so could not have overlooked any thing, which though not essential, had yet been an additional beauty or perfection, had it been retained. Why, when we have an Easter hymn, should it be Papistical to think Advent hymns, with which the Breviary abounds, had been an accession to our service, realizing as they do the coming and immediate presence of our LORD? or to term the Breviary and Missal, from which most of our own Prayer-book is taken, "precious relics of antiquity?"

My Lord, I would not be misunderstood; we do

¹ See Appendix, Nos. 38. 40, 41. 48. 72. and close of "Earnest Remonstrances," prefixed to Tracts, vol. 3.

not wish, we have never expressed a wish, to have any alteration in the Liturgy of our Church; as we mistrust others in their way, so we mistrust ourselves in our own; they think that our Church erred in retaining too much, we think that she might have retained more of what was ancient in the Breviary and the Missal, without approximating in any way to the corruptions of modern Rome: but there is this difference in our principles, that they, not accustomed to any high views of Church discipline, for the most part as soon as they have an end in view, which they think good, think also that it is good to realize it any how; form societies, enter into combinations, prepare schemes for accomplishing it, take the initiative in it, hoping that those "set over us in the LORD" the Bishops of our Church, will in time fall into it. They are, what they have upbraided one of our friends for terming himself, "Ecclesiastical agitators;" only our friend meant by the name "to rouse the Church from within to a sense of her own privileges and gifts," they act upon it, as referring to *outward* changes, whether in her Liturgy or discipline, produced by the "agitation" of a portion of her members. We have been taught to know our own place in the LORD's vineyard; that we are "under authority;" that our office is not to reform our Church, to add or to take away from her, but to obey her; to study her character, to see how we may more and more bring out and realize her teaching and her principles. We have, further than this, said

¹ Froude's Remains, T. i. p. 258.

again and again (and I refer to this, because they who blame us should at least know our principles), that whatever is done for the Church must not be done by a majority in her, that (to use the words of one of us), "Whatever is done for the Church as a whole, " must be done by the Church as a whole ¹." More than this, the writer among us, who from his peculiar mode of expressing himself, could least be judged of by partial extracts, and so has been, perhaps, the most extensively misunderstood, sums up in this reverential way his arguments for not further shortening the Church services. It is manifest that his own heart (one may speak of him, because he is at rest) was with those ages, when "they complied with Scripture to the letter, praised God seven times a day, besides their morning and evening prayer." Yet he thus sums up his account of the gradual contraction of them ². "This, it will be said, is an argu-

¹ Pref. to St. Augustine's Confessions, p. ix. add. App. No. 54.

² Froude's Remains, t. ii. p. 382. Of the same kind is the passage in which, while referring to the changes in our Communion Service, through the foreign reformers, as "a judgment on the Church," he thankfully acquiesces in our present service as "crumbs from the Apostles' table." Better (if one might so expand his metaphor) in itself, to have the whole than the fragments; but better again to have the fragments than the whole, when mingled with foreign ingredients, so that there is "death in the pot," if not to individuals, yet to the Church generally; nay better again, perhaps, for us, because more suited to us (such as we now are) to be contented with "the crumbs," having again become babes who have "need of milk not of strong meat:" and

“ment not so much for retaining the present form
 “of the Prayer-book” [for which he had been con-
 tending] “as for resorting to what is older. To my
 “own mind, it is an argument for something different
 “from either, *for diffidence*. I very much doubt,
 “whether in these days the spirit of true devotion is
 “at all understood, and *whether an attempt to go for-*
 “*ward or backward, may not lead our innovations to*
 “*the same result*. If the blind lead the blind, shall
 “they not both fall into the ditch?” I at least, my
 Lord, must own that I felt impressed and reprov-
 ed by this deep and self-restraining feeling of a young
 and ardent mind, mingling self-abasement with aspi-
 rations after something higher, and acknowledging
 himself unworthy to “unloose” even “the shoe-
 latchet” of that form of worship which in our own
 devotions we so imperfectly realize.

The feeling of our friend in this passage, and our
 own, is briefly this, we must have acted up more to
 the theory of our Church as she is, before we attempt
 to alter any ritual belonging to her. We must
 amend ourselves before we amend any thing of her's.
 When the body of our Clergy shall have acted up to
 her injunctions, by performing for years, day by day,
 her daily service, then may they be judges whether
 any improvements may be introduced into that
 service; when our service shall have become daily
 so also it is implied, they are “crumbs” which we are not worthy
 to gather up. The expression is abasement of self, not deroga-
 tion of our service, which is but too good for most of us.

instead of weekly, then may we judge whether any additions should be made to that of the LORD's day; when people, by the daily devotional use of the Psalms, shall have come to learn some portion of their depth, then they will see whether they are not in truth Christian hymns, and how much more of Christian truth they contain than the popular modern hymns, now often in use among us; when we have learnt and taught our congregations the blessedness of infant Baptism, and to be gladdened instead of wearied by seeing our little ones, one by one, made members of CHRIST, or have realized the blessings of our own engrafting into CHRIST, then may they perhaps judge of the language of the Baptismal service; when we have become alive to the importance of a true confession of the Holy Trinity, how much belongs to it, how manifold and subtle the temptations to deviate from it, have jealously observed our own inherent tendencies, and to what heresies our own frame of mind was inclined, or from which we have, perhaps, on the very road, been snatched, then may men judge fitly whether "our Church¹" at this day needeth" not, in the Athanasian Creed, "those ancient preservatives, which ages before us were so glad to use;" or rather, when our whole selves shall have been disciplined by her solemn rounds of prayers, thanksgivings, fastings, festivals, Communions, shall we be formed in her model and

¹ Hooker, Eccl. Pol. V. xlii. 13. ed. Keble.

so shall understand her, and may supply any thing lacking to her. Till then, our only safe course is to abide as we are, fitting ourselves to receive any enlargement of our treasures, by learning gratefully to appreciate and to use those which we have. What is good in itself might not be good to us, until we are other than we are.

It is then, my Lord, by judging of us according to their own habits of mind, and inferring that we should feel, act, and think as they would, were they in our stead, that they have come to these strange notions about us. They, with the impatience of modern habits, could not see a fancied defect, without at once casting about how *they* might remove it ; they cannot understand that men should think it their duty to sit still, should not have a wish to remove it, if they could ; should think that it had been better otherwise, that hereafter what they think best in the abstract, may be best for our Church ; may even speak of these things in the hopes of preparing for their ultimate restoration, if it may be, in the days of our sons' sons ; but meanwhile would not, if they might, restore them. I mean not in so saying to claim any superiority for ourselves over others ; we are, each as we have been trained to be ; the difference is in the systems, wherein we have been formed ; I would only account for the mistakes which must arise, if those who act upon one set of principles are judged upon by the other. Thus, we would freely express,

as have many of the Bishops of our Church¹, our conviction that the revisers of our Liturgy did unadvisedly in yielding some more explicit statements of doctrine to the suggestions of foreign reformers, whose tone of mind was different from that of our Church; yet could we adopt the words of one, with whose views probably we do not coincide; "Happy is it for the Church, that there has always between these opposite parties [who would reform the Prayer-book in opposite ways] "a much larger body of worshippers, who have used their book of Common Prayer with undisturbed devotion, offering thanks to God continually for His unspeakable gift²."

These sentiments we have often expressed³; and I may extract here a statement made in a periodical⁴, expressing for the most part our sentiments, and which was quoted with pleasure at the time, as a declaration of our practical views, by one⁵, whose valued life was devoted to the maintenance of our Church as she is, and the uniform opposer of whatever threatened her with organic change.

"If Anglo-Catholics did but understand their posi-

¹ Such as Bishop Overall, Abp. Sancroft, and Sharp, Bp. Hicke and Horsley. Tract No. 81. ed. 2.

² Pref. to two books of Edward VI. compared. Oxford, 1838. d. xxxv.

³ See Appendix, Nos. 24. 54.

⁴ British Critic, vol. 24. p. 69.

⁵ Rev. H. J. Rose. British Magazine, vol. xiv. p. 219, 20.

“ tion, it would be no despicable one. For ourselves,
 “ we find enough of satisfaction in it, not to be eager
 “ for any of those changes in the relation of Church
 “ to State, which late political events and constitu-
 “ tional reforms make abstractedly fitting. What
 “ may be the duty of persons in high stations in the
 “ Church, is another matter, or what might be the
 “ Church’s duty if her members one and all were of
 “ one mind and one judgment in all things, or what
 “ may be the duty of individuals as a matter of con-
 “ science in the event of certain contingencies; but
 “ at this moment, we conceive that Catholic truth
 “ will spread and flourish more satisfactorily under the
 “ existing state of things than on any alteration which
 “ could be devised. We feel no desire for the meet-
 “ ing of convocation; we are not even earnest in
 “ behalf of a repeal of the Statute of Præmunire,
 “ though it would certainly be becoming and just.
 “ We want changes of no kind, whether in the
 “ Prayer Book, or Articles, or Homilies, or Govern-
 “ ment, except anything can be shewn to us in our
 “ present state to be literally and directly sinful. We
 “ are content to take things as we have received
 “ them, and are quite sure that that system which
 “ was sufficient for the expansive minds of Andrews or
 “ Laud, has not been so circumscribed by subsequent
 “ political events, but it will hold us pigmies, how-
 “ ever large we grow. We may like some parts of
 “ it less than others; we may conceive that some
 “ parts might be more primitive, other parts more

“ finished ; but we are thankful to have, and content
 “ to use, what has come down to us ; and even where
 “ any thing has had an unsatisfactory origin, we will
 “ make the best of it, and receive it into, and assimi-
 “ late it to, the glorious deposit which we inherit
 “ from the Apostles.”

But setting aside these vague suspicions, I would now proceed to lay before your Lordship, in connection with the Articles of our Church, what we (following, as we are assured, those who have been ever accounted the great lights of our Church) believe to be her doctrine, on the points whereon we are accused ; and that (wherever the case admits) in contrast with Romanism on the one hand, and Ultra-Protestantism on the other. Thus it will appear, I trust, that the “ *via media*,” along which we, with our Church, would fain tread, though distinct from the bye ways of Ultra-Protestantism, is a broad and tangible line, not verging towards, or losing itself in Romanism. Rather is it the “ old path” of the Primitive Church, after whose model our own was reformed, and which, amid the entanglements of the modern deviations of Rome, our reformers wished, I believe, to trace out.

On the first five articles of our Church, those which relate to the Holy Trinity, happily no imputation has been cast against us ; and on these, even the Church of Rome is allowed to have transmitted faithfully the doctrine of the primitive Church. Would my Lord, that there were no signs of unsoundness on any other side ! But, whereas a traditionary faith would be

safe with regard to these essential articles, in that it would depart neither to the right nor to the left from that which the Universal Church had attested to be the Apostolic and Scriptural creed, the greater, because unsuspected, danger will beset those who profess to draw their faith, unaided, from Holy Scripture. If it overtake them not, it is because their faith is better than the principles which they profess; they are sound and orthodox, not in consequence of their principles, but in despite of their natural tendency. The natural bias of what terms itself a "Scriptural Theology" is to a naked Creed; it would cast aside all but Scriptural terms; confine itself to Scriptural phrases; reject as "scholastic distinctions" the fuller declarations, which have been committed to the Church; boasts of contenting itself with what it terms practical truths, or what it decides to be such; takes further statements, first as simply negative, then supersedes them as having been useful formerly, but not needed now¹, dwells not upon them, drops them

¹ "The like may be said of the *Gloria Patri* and the Athanasian Creed. It was first brought into the Church to the end that men thereby should make an open profession in the Church of the Divinity of the Son of God against the detestable opinion of Arius and his disciples, wherewith at that time marvellously swarmed almost the whole of Christendom. Now that it has pleased the Lord to quench that fire, there is no such cause why these things should be in the Church, at the least why that *Gloria Patri* should be so often repeated."—Cartwright ap. Hooker, E. P. V. xlii. 1. ed. Keble, and Hooker's answer, especially § 11 sqq.

from its Creed, takes an attitude of hostility against them, generalizes its faith ; and then, since the mind must think one way or other, whenever subjects are brought before it in detail, falls an easy prey to the heresies, from which the Church would have rescued them. All true Theology must of necessity be Scriptural ; but that which terms itself a "Scriptural Theology," has always been a stepping-stone to Socinianism or Rationalism. It begins in an ungrateful spirit, setting at nought the teaching of the Church, and "leaning upon its own understanding ;" and it ends in being left to its own understanding, and being "given over to an undistinguishing mind." Such has been the case with every Protestant body, except those *connected with* our own Church, though not *of* it ; such is the course, which America, as far as it is not Anglican or Romanist, is now taking ; and no one can observe the way in which unsound ¹ American publications are creeping into this country, by whom introduced, with what apologies in one instance, for Socinianism ; without being convinced that the Ultra-Protestant sects in this country, so far as they do not return to the Church or relapse into Romanism, will take the same course. Those in our Church, who have fraternized with them, are upheld by a traditional instruction, of which they are unaware, in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds ; and while they de-

¹ See Tracts for the Times, Vol. iii. No. 73. "On the introduction of rationalistic principles into religion."

claim against tradition, are probably upheld by tradition against heresies which destroy the soul. And so, we trust, they will continue; but though there is all hope that they will be protected against the grosser forms of heresy, the subtler form of Sabellianism creeps over the mind almost unperceived; and the objections against the title *θεοτόκος*, with which we have been assailed, imply that some have sadly forgotten, what was the origin of the Nestorian heresy¹.

This instance may illustrate the danger of an over-anxiety to recede from Rome, or of sacrificing truths which that corrupt Church has abused; it would lead to too long and involved a discussion to point out, article by article, wherein we, with our Church, differ from that of Rome; I will therefore trespass no longer upon your Lordship's time than the occasion requires, and will confine myself to those articles upon which we have been rumoured to approach nearer to Rome, than the limits of our Church allow. In so doing, I must make many statements, which to your Lordship are trite and familiar; but my object is to lay before your Lordship an explicit confes-

¹ "The Christian Knowledge Society has latterly erased from one of its publications the phrase, 'The mother of God,' rightly judging it to be Popish. The British Critic demands its reinstatement, observing, 'As to styling the Blessed Virgin *the mother of God*, did the Essex ministers ever chance to hear of the council of Ephesus?'"—Essays on the Church, p. 288.; also p. 304. Yet the State, by advice of our Church, acknowledged that what the Council of Ephesus "ordered, judged, or determined to be heresy," is such, 1 Eliz. 1. 36.

sion, not to say anything new upon subjects so often handled.

Art. VI. and XX.—*On the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation; and Of the authority of the Church.*

These two articles must necessarily be taken together, in order to understand fully the meaning of our Church, on the relation of the authority of the Church to that of Holy Scripture. In the first she declares that “Holy Scripture *contains* all things *necessary to salvation*, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be *required* of any man to be believed as an article of the Faith; or be thought requisite or *necessary to salvation.*” The article is manifestly directed against the Church of Rome, which has made new articles of *faith*, and so does “*require* to be believed as *necessary to salvation,*” things which are not contained in Holy Scripture. But the article, though it states, that Holy Scripture “*contains* all things *necessary to salvation,*” does not say that it *teaches* them in such wise, that every one may collect them thence for himself: nor does it even say, that things may not be believed or practised, which are not contained in Holy Scripture (so that of course, they be not contrary to it) but only that they must not be “*required* to be believed as *necessary to salvation.*” It is remarkable that this limitation, which is so singularly

overlooked¹ by those who employ this article against the right use of tradition, occurs, wherever the sufficiency of Holy Scripture is mentioned; so that the compilers of this article must have just meant to exclude the case to which people now so carelessly apply it, of “things, *not necessary to salvation.*” Thus, again, in the engagement required at Ordination and Consecration, this limitation is inserted in each clause; “Are you persuaded that the holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all Doctrine *required of necessity for eternal salvation* through faith in Christ Jesus? and “are you determined out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach *nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation*, but that which you shall be persuaded, may be concluded and proved by Holy Scripture²?” The very word also, “required,” shews that the Church had in view some one in authority who had the power to “require.” In the preceding articles our Church had embodied the doctrines of the Creeds, which, and which only are Articles of Faith, or “necessary to be believed in order to salvation.” Those

¹ Thus, one argues that the Apostolical succession is against our Articles, because it cannot be proved by Scripture, and by that Article nothing is to be held [omitting “as necessary to salvation”] which cannot be so proved. There seems to be the same sort of confusion in “Dr. Hook’s Call to Union, answered,” p. 9. though the instances given are mostly Popish corruptions, and so against “tradition” also.

² See further Mr. Keble’s Postscript to 3rd ed. of the Sermon, entitled “Primitive tradition recognized in Holy Scripture.” p. 12. sqq.

which follow, are Articles of Religion, which she did not receive from the ancient Church, but which she framed herself, not as essential to Communion (for this she requires only the belief in the Articles of the Apostles' Creed) but "for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion." Accordingly, at the very outset of this new range of Articles, she draws limits to her own powers and to those of the Church Universal. She does not, like the Church of Rome, increase the Creed, which no particular Church has the right to do; and she lays down within what limits the Creed may be enlarged by the Church Universal; namely, only as to whatsoever is "read in Holy Scripture, or may be proved thereby." She lays down that Holy Scripture is the sole *source* of "all things necessary to salvation;" and that nothing must be "required to be believed as necessary to salvation," but what is drawn from that source; but both at the beginning and the end she restrains what she says, to "things necessary to salvation." So then it is *probable* that our Church means that things may be *required* to be believed, (provided it be not upon peril of salvation,) which are not proved by Holy Scripture: but *certain*, that according to her, things not in Holy Scripture may be subjects of belief; and that there is a power, somewhere residing, which may "*require*" to be "believed as necessary to salvation," whatever *can* be proved by Holy Scripture. For the limitation were absurd, that things not proveable by Holy Scripture, must "*not* be required to be

believed “*as necessary to salvation,*” unless those which can be so proved, might be required. This very article then, in laying down the “sufficiency of Holy Scripture as “the *source* of all saving truth,” at the same time recognizes the existence of an authority which may “require to be believed as essential to salvation,” what it “can prove thereby.” And this authority, in the 20th Article she declares, as in the 6th she implies it, to be the Church; for in the 20th Article, there recurs the same language, that, “as it must not “decree any thing contrary to Holy Writ, so besides “the same, ought it not to *enforce* any thing to be “believed *for necessity of salvation.*” Within this same limit, however, drawn equally by the 6th, and 20th Articles, the 20th Article expressly states, what the 6th implies; “The Church has authority in “controversies of Faith.” The Church is subject to Holy Scripture, but set over individuals; she may not (1) “expound one place of Holy Scripture that “it be repugnant to another,” nor may she (2) “decree any thing *against* Holy Writ,” nor may she (3) “*besides* the same, enforce any thing to be believed “for necessity of salvation;” but then the very fixing of these limits of her power, shews that she has power within these limits; that she is the “expositor “of Holy Writ,” provided she do “not expound one “place that it be repugnant to another;” she may “decree things,” provided they be not “against Holy “Writ;” she may “enforce things to be believed” even “*for necessity of salvation,*” provided they be

neither against, nor besides, Holy Scripture." But the power of "expounding," "decreeing," "ordaining," implies that her children are to receive her expositions, and obey her decrees, and accept her authority in controversies of faith: and the appeal lies not to their "private judgment;" they are not the arbiters, whether she pronounce rightly or no; for what sort of decree or authority were that, of which every one were first to judge, and then if his judgment coincided with the law, to obey? who would not see the absurdity of this in matters of human judgment? "If thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge." Jas. iv. 11. "If I be a father, where is mine honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear?" Mal. i. 6.

But our Church in this article further and accurately defines the nature of her authority; the Church is a "keeper and witness of Holy Writ;" she is its guardian; it is from her that we know of what books the Canon of Scripture consists: she is the "witness" to the truths which it contains; not a "judge" over it, not having to determine new truth, or erect new articles of faith; but a witness to the doctrine which she herself received in continued succession from the primitive Church, as being contained in Holy Scripture.

In brief, then, my Lord, the meaning of our Church (as we conceive) in these Articles is, that the Scripture is the sole authoritative source of the Faith, *i. e.* of "things to be believed in order to salvation;"

the Church is the medium through which that knowledge is conveyed to individuals; she, under her responsibility to GOD, and in subjection to His Scripture, and with the guidance of His Spirit, testifies to her children, what truths are necessary to be believed in order to salvation; expounds Scripture to them; determines, when controversies arise; and this, not in the character of a judge, but as a "witness" to what she herself received.

And in this view of the meaning of our Church, we are further confirmed by the Canon of the Convocation of 1571, to which we have of late often had occasion to appeal; the same Convocation which enforced subscription to the Articles.

"They [preachers] shall in the first place be careful
 " never to teach any thing from the pulpit to be reli-
 " giously held and believed by the people, but what
 " is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New
 " Testament, and *collected out of that very Doctrine by*
 " *the Catholic Fathers, and ancient Bishops.*"

So have we ever wished to teach, "what is
 " agreeable to the Doctrine of the Old or New
 " Testament," and as the test of its being thus agree-
 " able, we would take, not our own private and in-
 " dividual judgments, but that of the Universal Church,
 " as attested by the "Catholic Fathers and Ancient
 " Bishops."

This, my Lord, were perhaps sufficient; nor need
 we, we conceive, go into the private opinions of those
 engaged in our Reformation; seeing that they, in many

points, varied from each other, and some of them on some points from themselves: and we have the injunction to take the Articles in their plain grammatical sense. Nor indeed have we our Articles from them; but Articles, in which their opinions have been in some respects modified; we have not the 42 Articles of Edward VI., but the 39 of Q. Elizabeth; and these have their authority to us from the agreement of our Church in 1562 and 1571. We are then in no respects even guided to look to the private opinions of any instruments of the Reformation, as interpreters of the Articles: since we are expressly referred not to them, but to the "literal and grammatical sense"¹ of the Articles themselves. But we could go further; and show that they who are of most note among them, wished to submit their own judgments to that of Antiquity, and at all events, *desired* to hold no other doctrine, than that which had been received by the Primitive Church. They did not appeal to her, as has been recently said, as an *argumentum ad hominem*, merely to refute an adversary with his own weapons². Their very language shows that they were in earnest, and speak with reverence. Abp. Cranmer, for instance, appeals, at a solemn moment, to them, and confesses³ "in *all* my doctrine and preaching, both of

¹ K. James's declaration prefixed to the Articles.

² *e. g.* Dr. Hook's "Call to Union" answered, p. 11.

³ Works, vol. iv. pp. 126, 7. See further and other authorities in Mr. Manning's Appendix to a Sermon on the Rule of Faith, p. 6. sqq.

“ the Sacrament, and of other my doctrine, *whatsoever*
 “ *it be*, not only I mean and judge, as the Catholic
 “ Church and the most holy Fathers of old meant and
 “ judged, but also, I would gladly use the same words
 “ that they used, and not use any other words ; but to
 “ set my hand to all and singular their speeches,
 “ phrases, ways and forms of speech, which they do
 “ use in their treatises upon the Sacraments, and to
 “ keep still their interpretation.”

And hence our Divines fearlessly appeal to the whole period when the Church was one, and spake one language, and could speak as one ; as Bishop Jewell in his celebrated challenge ¹ : “ I said, perhaps
 “ boldly, as it might then seem to some men, but as
 “ I myself and the learned of our adversaries themselves do well know, sincerely and truly, that none
 “ of them all, that this day stand against us, are able
 “ or shall ever be able to prove against us any one of
 “ all those points, either by the Scriptures, or by
 “ example of the primitive Church, or by the old
 “ Doctors, or by the ancient general Councils.—

“ The words that I then spake, as near as I can
 “ call them to mind, were these : If any learned man
 “ of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men
 “ that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient
 “ sentence out of any old Catholic Doctor, or Father,

¹ Sermon preached at Paul's Cross, (Works, pp. 57, 58.) extracted more at length in Tracts for the Times, No. 78. “ Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the duty of maintaining *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus traditum est.*”

“ or out of any old general Council, or out of the
 “ Holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of
 “ the primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly
 “ and plainly proved, that there was any private mass
 “ in the whole world at that time, for the space of
 “ six hundred years after Christ ; or that there was
 “ then any Communion ministered unto the people
 “ under one kind ; or that the people had their
 “ common prayers then in a strange tongue, that
 “ they understood not : or that the Bishop of Rome
 “ was then called an universal Bishop, or the head
 “ of the universal Church, &c. ; if any man alive were
 “ able to prove any of these articles, by any one clear
 “ or plain clause or sentence, either of the Scriptures
 “ or of the old Doctors, or of any old general Council,
 “ or by any example of the primitive Church : I
 “ promised then that I would give over and subscribe
 “ unto him.”.....

“ Besides all that I have said already, I will say
 “ further, and yet nothing so much as might be said.
 “ If any one of all our adversaries be able clearly
 “ and plainly to prove, by such authority of the
 “ Scriptures, the old Doctors and Councils, as I said
 “ before, that it was then lawful for the Priest to
 “ pronounce the words of consecration closely and in
 “ silence to himself, &c. &c.—if any one of all our
 “ adversaries be able to vouch any one of all these
 “ articles, by any such sufficient authority of Scrip-
 “ tures, Doctors, or Councils, as I have required, as
 “ I said before, so say I now again, I am content to

“ yield unto him and to subscribe. But I am well
“ assured that they shall never be able truly to allege
“ one sentence. And because I know it, therefore
“ I speak it lest ye haply should be deceived.”

Nor do we in this, nor did they, approximate to Romanism ; but rather they herein took the strongest and the only unassailable position against it. Rome and ourselves have alike appealed to the authority of “ the Church ;” but, in the mouth of a Romanist the Church means, so much of the Church as is in communion with herself, in other words, it means herself : with us, it means the Universal Church, to which Rome, as a particular Church, is subject, and ought to yield obedience. With Rome, it matters not whether the decision be of the Apostolic times, or of yesterday ; whether against the teaching of the early Church, or with it ; whether the whole Church universal throughout the world agree in it, or only a section, which holds communion with herself : she, as well as Calvin, makes much of the authority of the Fathers, when she thinks that they make for her ; but she, equally with the founder of the Ultra-Protestants, sets at nought their authority, so soon as they tell against her : she unscrupulously sets aside the judgment of all the Ancient Doctors of the Church, unhesitatingly dismisses the necessity of agreement even of the whole Church at this day, and proudly taking to herself the exclusive title of Catholic, sits alone a Queen in the midst of the earth, and dispenses her decrees from herself. No,

my Lord! they ill understand the character of Rome, or their own strength, who think that she would really commit herself, as Cranmer did, to Christian Antiquity, or who would not gladly bring her to that test! What need has she of Antiquity, who is herself infallible, except to allure mankind to believe her so? "I, for my part," says one of no mean note among them¹, "to speak candidly, would rather credit "one Pope, in matters touching the mysteries of the "Faith, than a thousand Augustines, Jeromes, or "Gregories. For I believe and know that the sovereign Pontiff cannot err in things, which belong to the Faith, because the Church's power of determining what relates to the Faith, resides in the Pontiff. So then the error of the Pontiff would be the error of the Universal Church. But the Universal Church cannot err. Tell me not of a Council," &c.

This is the very complaint, which our Divines always brought against her controversialists. Thus Bp. Jewell²: "But one thing specially much misliketh M. Harding above all the rest; that, the better to disclose the deformities and weakness of his doctrine, I have alleged so many Canonists and school Doctors. For all those he weigheth no better now than Esop's fables. And therefore he saith, 'As for the gew-gaws of the schoolmen and

¹ Corn. Mussus, Bp. of Bitonto, quoted by Mr. Newman, *Romanism and popular Protestantism*, Lect. 2. "on Romanism as neglectful of Antiquity," p. 98.

² Preface to *Defence of the Apology*.

“ canonists, I despise them utterly.’ Are all the
 “ school-doctors and canonists now become *intesta-*
 “ *biles, i. e.* so far out of credit, so infamous and so
 “ vile, that they may not be allowed to bear witness?
 “ Whose then are they? Are they not all M.
 “ Harding’s own doctors? Is he now ashamed of his
 “ own?—And yet will he suddenly condemn them
 “ all, every one, by one sentence, Abbots, Bishops,
 “ Archbishops, Decrees, Decretals, Cardinals, Saints,
 “ and Popes and all together! But we must
 “ pardon M. Harding; he dealeth indifferently
 “ and is nothing partial. For even with the like
 “ reverence he useth all the ancient Doctors of
 “ the Church, and others of later time, that fight
 “ on his side, and are allied to him. ‘Tertullian,’
 “ he saith, ‘ was an heretic, and wrote this or that
 “ in defence of his heresy.’ ‘St. Cyprian,’ he saith,
 “ ‘ had an ill cause, and defended a falsehood, and
 “ was driven to the very same shifts whereunto all
 “ hereticks are driven.’ ‘ It seemeth,’ saith he, ‘ St.
 “ Jerome was deceived by a rumour,’ &c. &c. Thus,
 “ we see, M. Harding has a commission to control
 “ all manner of Doctors whatsoever, Greeks, Latins,
 “ Old, New, his own and others, if they come not
 “ readily to his purpose. Nicolaus Cusanus¹ saith,
 “ ‘ Pope Eugenius tells us this thing is true, if he
 “ will have it true, and not otherwise.’”

The Anglican Divines, then, whom we follow as the

¹ De Concordan. l. ii. c. 20.

expositors of the meaning of our Church, differ from Rome in the following points. *They* appeal to the authority of the Universal Church as long as it was one; Rome to the Church, ancient or modern, in communion with herself: *they*, to the *consent* of the Early Church, however it be ascertained; Rome, to the decision of Councils confirmed by the Bishop of Rome: *they* rest on it as bearing testimony to an Apostolic origin; Rome, as the result of her own infallibility: *they* hold that the Universal Church is only a witness to the Catholic truth, and has no power of forming new articles of faith; Rome, that even the Modern Church in communion with herself, has that power: *they*, that the Church is a witness; Rome, that she is a judge: *they*, that the more recent may not contradict the ancient; Rome, that she may, and may correct them: *they*, that the meaning of Holy Scripture, of which the Church is the interpreter, must always be one and the same, to be collected from "the agreement of the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops;" Rome, that the Church may, under different circumstances, affix different meanings, and that the meaning last affixed supersedes the former¹: *they*, in a word, seek for a

¹ See the remarkable extract from Card. Cusa in Mr. Newman's Romanism, &c. Lect. 2. "On Romanism as neglectful of Antiquity," p. 97, *note*. Here a few sentences may be extracted; his task is to defend the Council of Constance for refusing the cup to the laity, contrary to our Lord's institution and the practice of antiquity, as itself acknowledged. "Let it not disturb thee, that "at different times, the rites of sacrifices and even of sacraments

genuine Apostolic tradition, to be established by the consent of all times, all Churches, and the great Doctors of all those Churches; Rome, (like Ultra-Protestants,) follows modern traditions, assumes them to be Apostolic, simply because she holds them, and she is infallible; and so was the ancient Church, in communion with Rome; and so she must have taught then the same as Rome does now. And thus she brings in her modern corruptions, against which the appeal to Christian Antiquity is the surest safeguard. Scriptural language she can (as did the enemy of mankind to whom she is partially in bondage,) plausibly apply: many of her chief corruptions, she (in common with Ultra-Protestants) rests on the language of Scripture, and (in common also with them) in contradiction to the ancient Church; but the appeal to Antiquity she cannot elude. It is too full, too cir-

“are found to differ, the truth abiding the same; and that
 “Scriptures are *adapted to the times, and variously understood,*
 “being explained at one time in conformity to the rite then
 “universally prevalent, and again their meaning being changed
 “when the rite is changed. For Christ to whom the Father hath
 “delivered the kingdom of heaven and earth, in both uses a sort of
 “economy, and either *by secret inspiration, or by a clearer expla-*
 “*nation, suggests what suits each distinct period.* Wherefore if
 “the Church’s interpretation of the *same Gospel precept be diffe-*
 “*rent now from heretofore, yet this sense now current in the*
 “*Church, being inspired for the use of the Church, as being suited*
 “*for the times, is to be accepted as the way of salvation. It is*
 “*therefore an absurd argument, to try to object to an universal*
 “rite of the [Roman] Church out of the writings of *their pre-*
 “*decessors.*”

cumstantial. No, my Lord, they only who suspect Antiquity, because it is opposed to modern and private doctrines of their own, need fear committing themselves and their Church to it; we have full confidence in our Church, and know that she can stand the test of primitive doctrine, and that Rome cannot. Rome may entice the unwary by the name of Antiquity, but she dare not pledge herself to the reality: if in name she seem to take the same ground as the Anglican Divines, she *must* differ from them. Or to look upon it in another way; Rome differs from us, *as to the authority* which she ascribes to tradition; she regards it as *coordinate*, our divines as *subordinate*: *as to the way in which it is to be employed*; she, as independent of Holy Scripture, our's, as subservient to, and blended with, it; *as to its limits*, she supposes that the Church of Rome has a power of imposing new articles, necessary to be believed for salvation; our's, that all such articles were comprized at first in the Creed, and that the Church has only the power of clearing, defining, and expounding these fixed articles: *as to the office of the Church therein*; Rome supposes that the Church may select of different opinions that which she judges right; our's, that she must take that which is attested by universal consent: *as to the power of the Church*; Rome supposes that the Church may stamp that as certain, which before was really uncertain; our's, that she only ascertains that to be certain which in fact was so, but had not formally been pronounced to be so:

as to the source of that power ; Rome places it in her own assumed infallibility ; our's, in the office of the Church, as the depository of, and witness to, the traditions confided to her : so then, beyond the name of tradition, the Church of Rome and our Divines differ in every thing besides.

It might yet be satisfactory to state two or three points bearing upon this subject :—

1st, (lest the name of tradition should appear to imply an indefinite body of truth,) as to the *subjects* comprehended in the traditions acknowledged by the Church. These, as drawn out by the learned Dean Field¹, are (1) the number and names of the authors of books divine and canonical, (2) that summary of the chief heads of Christian doctrine contained in the Apostles' Creed, (3) “The form of Christian doctrine and explication of the several parts thereof, which the first Christians, receiving of the same Apostles that delivered to them the Scriptures, commended to posterities.” [Whence it was enabled to expand the Apostles' Creed into the Nicene and Athanasian.] (4) “Rites not expressly contained in Scripture, though the grounds, reasons, or causes of their necessity, or benefit are ; as Infant Baptism.” (5) The particular application of things generally ordained ; “of this sort, many think, the observation of the Lenten fast, the fast of the fourth and sixth days of the week, and

¹ Of the Church, p. 375, extracted more fully in the *Catena* above quoted, p. 12—15.

“some others.” Or, as Bp. Beveridge¹ states them, somewhat less rigidly. (1) The inspiration of Holy Scripture. (2) Things “which, although they are “not read in express and definite terms in the Holy “Scriptures, are yet *by the common consent of all “Christians* drawn out of these Scriptures (as the “articles of the Creed). These and such like, al- “though they are not either in the Old or New “Testament, declared in so many words or syllables, “yet have they, as founded on both, ever been agreed “on by all Christians, certain few heretics only ex- “cepted, of whom no more account is to be had in “religion, than of monsters in nature.” (3) Ob- servances, “no where enjoined in Holy Scripture “directly and by name, yet have they, during 1400 “years from the Apostles, been every where received “into public use of the Church; nor can there be “found any Church during that period not agreeing “thereto. So that there have been, as it were, “certain *common notions* from the beginning im- “planted in the minds of all Christians, not so much “from any particular passages of Holy Scripture, as “from all; from the general scope and tenor of the “whole Gospel; from the very nature and purpose “of the religion therein established; and, finally “from the constant tradition of the Apostles, who

¹ Preface to Codex Canonum Eccl. Prim. vindicatus et illustr. translated at length, *ib.* p. 65 sqq.; and prefixed to the translation of the valuable Commonitory of Vincentius recently published at Oxford.

“together with the faith, propagated ecclesiastical
 “rites of this sort, and if I may so speak, general
 “interpretations of the Gospel. For on any other
 “supposition it would be incredible, or even impos-
 “sible, that they should have been received with so
 “unanimous a consent every where, always, and by
 “all.” In the second class of Bp. Beveridge may be
 included (4) interpretations of specific passages of
 Holy Scripture, upon which there is universal agree-
 ment in the ancient Church.

(2) *As to the power of the existing Church*; The
 right of the existing Church is limited not by any
 arbitrary line, but by facts. (1) As to matters nec-
 cessary to salvation the whole testimony of the
 Church has been given, so that her office thus far of
 necessity has ceased¹. The Creeds have received their
 completion, unless indeed some new heresy on its
 Articles could arise, in which case the whole Church,
 could it be assembled, might give witness against it.
 (2) In cases not so fixed, her tradition has in many
 cases been broken, so that she could no longer rest
 her decision upon her present testimony, but must
 collect it from those ages in which it was yet un-
 broken. And hence it is, not from any abstract ideal
 of the first ages, that our Divines appeal to the Church,
 “anterior to the division of the East and West.”

¹ Hence the Council of Ephesus forbade any additional Creed,
 beside that of Nice, being “presented to those converted from
 “Heathenism, Judaism, or any heresy.” This is contravened by
 Rome in the formation of Pope Pius’ Creed. See Perceval on the
 Roman Schism, p. 33.

(3) The "Indefectibility of the Church" is very different from the "Infallibility" assumed by Rome. We believe that (although Councils, which have been termed "General," or which Rome has claimed to be so, have erred,) no real Œcumenical Council ever did; *i. e.* no Council really representing the Universal Church. Our Church of old formally accepted the six Œcumenical Councils¹; our great Divines, who may be looked upon as speaking her voice, appeal, generally, to the period comprehending these six Councils², as that which has authority in matters of faith. And this they do, because the Church was then one, and it was to His one Church, and as being one, that our LORD's promise was made³. And now, on that ground, her functions are, in this respect, suspended; she cannot meet, as one; and this coincidence of the errors of these later days, and the interruption of her harmony, seem remarkably to illustrate this fulfilment of our LORD's promise: particular Churches have fallen into error, because the Church has separated, and the Church is prevented

¹ In the Council of Calchuythe, A. D. 785. (ap. Perceval on the Roman Schism, p. 5.) Our Church shortly after, at the great Council of Frankfort, rejected the Pseudo Synod of Nice, together with the Bishops of Germany and France, (see Palmer on the Church, ii. 200. sqq.) This has never been rescinded, and the state recognizes four specifically, (of which the other two are supplements,) and generally "others" without defining them, (1 Eliz. 1. 36.)—See also, Field and Hammond, ap. Palmer, ii. 171, 2.

² Newman on Romanism, Lect. 8. "Indefectibility of the Church Catholic," p. 250.

³ See Newman, l. c. p. 243. sqq. ed. 2.

from meeting, that she may not, as a whole, fix any of these errors. What further fulfilments our LORD's promise may have hereafter, we know not; or whether the Church shall again be at one, and so be in a condition to claim it in any enlarged degree. It might be so; for although we have broken our traditions, yet might an appeal to those of the Church, when it was yet one, set at rest what now agitates us. For the present, sufficient for us, what has been bestowed in the period of her unity; the main articles of the faith have been fixed and guarded by her, and we possess them in her Creeds, and believe that the Church shall, by virtue of her SAVIOUR's promise, preserve them to the end. With this, Rome is not content; *we* take the event, (as it is ever ruled to be) as the interpreter of prophecy; *she* would bind her LORD to accomplish it in her own way; will not accept of any thing short of what seems good to her; settles that the unity essential to its accomplishment, concentrates in herself; and in this way continues it on to the present time, applies it to every thing, great or small¹; and so gathers the promise around and identifies it with herself, and makes it part of her state and majesty. The indefectibility of the Universal Church is to become the safeguard of the one see of Rome, and to draw all other Churches to

¹ "Our sentiment then is, that the Church absolutely cannot err, neither in things absolutely necessary, nor in others, which she proposes to us to be believed or done, whether they are contained in Scripture or no."—Bellarm. Controv. de Eccl. iii. 14.

her footstool. This has been the *πρῶτον ψεῦδος* of Romanism, and her imposture, that she has claimed to herself the promise, which belonged to the whole Church. A high dignity belonged to her as the Apostolic Church of the West; and her traditions, as long as she kept them faithfully, had, naturally, a great estimation, when testimony was to be borne to Catholic truth; but she, instead of being "among the first three," would be alone; would have her voice not only essential, but alone essential; would make at all events the infallibility of a Council to depend upon the confirmation of her Bishop; teaching oftentimes also that even particular Councils approved by the Pope, became infallible, or that a general Council, in itself fallible, acquired an *ex post facto* infallibility through his approval¹. And thus, like him who was high among "the sons of God," but would be higher than his Creator made him, she

¹ "It is to be held, as of Catholic faith, that general Councils confirmed by the Sovereign Pontiff, cannot err, either in faith or morals." Bell. Ib. ii. 2. "The 2nd Prop. 'that particular Councils confirmed by the Sovereign Pontiff, cannot err in faith and morals,' is not equally certain, because that no Catholic denies, whereas this some do. But I only do not affirm that it is to be held as of Catholic Faith, because those who hold the contrary have not *yet* been condemned by the Church as heretics."—Ib. c. 9. "General Councils, before the confirmation of the Sovereign Pontiff, may err, unless the fathers in their definitions follow the instructions of the Pontiff."—Ib. c. 11. It is enough to stamp the character of Rome, that such perverted views should be favoured by her.

fell. The promise, which was a blessing and a high privilege to the Universal Church, became a snare to her feet, who arrogantly claimed it to herself. Where our LORD lodged it, through His Spirit Which dwelleth in her, it was safe; she who would be wise above that which was assigned her, has for the Spirit of Truth received a lying spirit, too mighty for her to control, and by him been goaded on, to prepare for herself her own destruction. Her claim is the invention of man, not the promise of CHRIST; it bears upon it the stamp of man's contrivance, in its lust of authority, furnishing the pretext for repudiating Canons¹ of Œcumenical Councils, from which Rome, for private ends, withdrew its sanction, and making private synods into Œcumenical and infallible Councils, when its ends are thereby served, setting herself in the place of the Church universal throughout the world: it has the fruit of man's contrivance, leading that unhappy Church into presumptuous definitions of questions, against the voice of Scripture and Antiquity, or to form wrong conclusions from a partial use of either, taking from either the first support of her existing system which comes to hand, without examining carefully whether it do support her or no, as resting in fact not on Scripture or Antiquity, but on her own assumed infallibility; using unrighteous expedients, as one unaccountable and beyond questioning; rash and headstrong in her own defence (as over-confident persons

¹ *E. g.* The 28th Canon of the Council of Ephesus.

are), not giving herself leisure to consider whether she were in the right or no, but obstinately defending each point on which she was censured; and thus multiplying her own perplexities, her precarious theories, and contradictions to Antiquity and Scripture, on which she professes to rest. Thus Satan has led her to the edge of a precipice, and there, by her very claim of infallibility, holds her fast; rendering it humanly impossible for her to retreat, ready to be cast down, unless God by an especial act of mercy, break the bond, "take¹ the prey from the mighty," and bid the "lawful captive" go free. Her vast system rests upon an assumed infallibility; she stands committed to every portion of it; and yet she cannot give account to those whom she holds captive, how they are to know that she is infallible, or in whom this infallibility resides². Nevertheless she stakes her existence on the belief. The Churches under the Roman sway may purify themselves, as did we; Rome herself has no escape (sorrowful as her doom is, which she has drawn upon herself), except through such a confession as those, who have committed themselves so deeply and so presumptuously, very rarely, it is to be feared, humble themselves to make. Roman infallibility, then, has no other relation to the doctrine of Indefectibility of the Church, than that of the corruption to the

¹ Isa. xlix. 24.

² Newman, *ib.* lect. 4. "Doctrine of Infallibility politically considered," p. 150, ed. 2.

truth which it has corrupted; the Romanist theory is bound up with *her* doctrine of traditions, she limits the doctrine on the one hand to the portion of the Church in communion with her, and on the other hand extends it to all subjects which that Church may determine; the Anglican view regards the promise as belonging to the universal Church, but restrained to those Articles of the faith which were delivered to her, and which in her real Œcumenical Councils she has defined; one may add, the Ultra-Protestant view narrows the promise, like the Church of Rome, in extent, to a handful of believing Christians, and, like Rome also, changes the subjects of the Faith, substituting a system of its own for Catholic truth; differing, as before, from Rome in this, that what Rome claims to the Churches of her own communion, it applies to individuals¹.

The contrast between the Roman claim to infallibility, and our Anglican acknowledgment of the indefectibility of the Church, has been so clearly pursued by Mr. Newman², that I must beg permission to insert it.

“ Both we and Romanists hold that the Church

¹ “ When they interpret these promises, so full of exceeding consolation, ‘ Lo I am with you always,’ and ‘ He shall guide you into all truth,’ as given to the universal Church as a whole, not to individual Christians, what else do they than take away from all Christians the confidence, which ought to result thence for their encouragement ?”—Calv. Institt. 4. 8. 11.

² L. c. “ Indefectibility of Church Catholic,” p. 259.

“ Catholic is unerring in its declarations of faith for
 “ saving doctrine ; but we differ from each other as
 “ to what is the faith, and what is the Church Catholic.
 “ They maintain that faith depends on the Church,
 “ we that the Church is built on faith. By Church
 “ Catholic we mean the Church Universal, as de-
 “ scended from the Apostles ; they those branches
 “ of it which are in communion with Rome. They
 “ consider the See of St. Peter to have a promise of
 “ permanence, we the Church Catholic and Apostolic.
 “ Again, they understand by the Faith, whatever
 “ the Church at any time declares to be faith ; we
 “ what it has actually so declared from the beginning.
 “ We hold that the Church Catholic will never de-
 “ part from these outlines of doctrine which the
 “ Apostles formally published ; they that she will
 “ never depart in any of her acts from that entire
 “ system, written and oral, public and private, ex-
 “ plicit and implicit, which they received and taught ;
 “ we that she has a gift of fidelity, they of dis-
 “ cretion.”

“ Again, both they and we anathematize those who
 “ deny the Faith ; but they extend the condemna-
 “ tion to all who question any decree of the Roman
 “ Church ; we apply it to those only who deny any
 “ article of the original Apostolical Creed. The creed
 “ of Romanism is ever subject to increase ; our’s is
 “ fixed once for all. We confine our anathema to the
 “ Athanasian Creed ; Romanists extend it to Pope
 “ Pius’s. They cut themselves off from the rest of

“ Christendom ; we cut ourselves off from no branch,
 “ not even from themselves. We are at peace with
 “ Rome as regards the essentials of faith ; but she tole-
 “ rates us as little as any sect or heresy. We admit her
 “ Baptism and her Orders ; her custom is to rebaptize
 “ and reordain our members who chance to join her.

“ These distinctions are sufficient for my present
 “ purpose, though they are only a few out of various
 “ differences which might be pointed out. They are
 “ surely portions of a real view, which, while it re-
 “ lieves the mind of those burdens and perplexities
 “ which are the portion of the mere Protestant, is
 “ essentially distinct from Romanism.”

(4) There yet remains one other fear which I would wish to remove, namely, lest this appeal to Christian Antiquity should abate of men’s reverence to their own Church. It is natural that they should dread this, who have looked upon their own Church as a modern Church. To them the authority of their own and the ancient Church must seem to stand in contrast ; to us the authority of either, though not equally full, still goes in the same direction. We wish not to add any thing to our Church, but to develope what she has ; it is admitted by all, that many points, being incidentally noticed in her formularies, need expansion : a modern school would wish to have this done exclusively by reference to the Reformers ; we, thankfully acknowledging her to be a sound member of the Church Catholic, from which her Liturgy is derived, would resort to the fountain

whence our stream is derived, not to the channels through which it has lately passed. We would view her in relation to the whole of which she is a part, the Primitive and Apostolic Church, whence she is descended, to which she belongs, "the rock out of which she was hewed, and the hole of the pit from which she was digged." This has ever been our profession. "This¹ is the very chiefest advantage which the warmest recommenders of tradition in our Church expect from it, *viz.* that attention to it should very much elevate men's ideas of the *existing* system, proving it divine in many points, where they now ignorantly suppose it human. This, and not the establishment of any mere theory, new or old, is the immediate object of those who have most earnestly urged, from time to time, the reverential study of Christian antiquity."

Our own Church is the immediate, the Church universal the ultimate visible authority; she is to us the representative of the Universal Church, as the Church Universal is of her LORD; our own derives her authority from the Universal Church, and cannot claim any, contrary to her: we belong to her, because we were baptized in her, and she is the descendant of the primitive Church in this land, and her Bishops "the successors of the Apostles:" we receive as Articles of Faith, what she delivers to us as fixed by the Universal Church; what she has by

¹ Keble. Postscript to 3rd edit. of Sermon on Tradition, p. 62. See also Pref. to St. Augustine's Confessions. p. viii. ix.

her private judgment deduced from Holy Scripture, we teach because we also think it to be so deducible; if we did not so think, we should obey, must belong to her, but could not teach: her Sacraments we receive, because she has received the commission to impart them; her rites, because she has the power to ordain or to change them. To our own Church we owe submission; to the decisions of the Church universal, Faith.

This relation, in which we stand as members both of a particular Church, and of the "Holy Church universal," is expressed with such pious humility by Archbishop Bramhall, that I too cannot but beg to express, in his language, what our wishes would be, as far as any of us may, or are forced to, speak of ourselves. "No ¹ one can justly blame me for honouring my spiritual mother, the Church of England, in whose womb I was conceived, at whose breasts I was nourished, and in whose bosom I hope to die." Yet though his love was to his immediate mother, his allegiance was more especially to the "mother of us all." He proceeds after a while: "Howsoever it be, I submit myself and my poor endeavours, first to the judgment of the Catholic Ecumenical essential Church, which if some of late days have endeavoured to hiss out of the Schools as a fancy, I cannot help it. From the beginning it was not so. And if I should mistake the right Catholic Church

¹ Works, p. 141, quoted more fully by Mr. Newman on Romanism; Advertisement.

“ out of human frailty or ignorance (which for my
 “ part I have no reason in the world to suspect, yet
 “ it is not impossible when the Romanists themselves
 “ are divided into five or six several opinions, what
 “ this Catholic Church, or what their infallible Judge
 “ is,) I do implicitly and in the preparation of my
 “ mind submit myself to the True Catholic Church,
 “ the Spouse of Christ, the Mother of the Saints,
 “ the Pillar of Truth. And seeing my adherence is
 “ firmer to the Infallible Rule of Faith, that is, the
 “ Holy Scriptures interpreted by the Catholic Church,
 “ than to mine own private judgment or opinions;
 “ although I should unwittingly fall into an error, yet
 “ this cordial submission is an implicit retractation
 “ thereof, and I am confident will be so accepted by
 “ the Father of Mercies, both from me and all others
 “ who seriously and sincerely do seek after peace
 “ and truth.

“ Likewise I submit myself to the Representative
 “ Church, that is, a free general Council, or as general
 “ as can be procured; and until then to the Church
 “ of England, wherein I was baptized, or to a national
 “ English Synod. To the determination of all which,
 “ and each of these respectively, according to the
 “ distinct degree of their authority, I yield a *con-*
 “ *formity* and *compliance*, or at the least and to the
 “ lowest of them an *acquiescence*.”

I have dwelt the longer upon this subject, because
 upon it some of the most vehement charges of ap-

proximating to Rome have of late been founded ; it were easier to draw a parallel (as has in part been done) between the Romanist and Ultra-Protestant. (1) Both agree in appealing to *their own* interpretation of Holy Scripture against the agreement of Catholic antiquity¹. (2) Both claim to this case

¹ See Mr. Newman, on Romanism, Lect. 7.—“ Instances of the abuse of private judgment,” § 5, 6. where he shows that Purgatory and the Pope’s Supremacy came in through misapplication of Scripture, *against* tradition. In like way, the right to administer the Holy Eucharist in one kind, is rested on passages of Scripture, Luke xxiv. 30. 35. Acts ii. 42. 46 ; xx. 7 ; xxvii. 35. which would be very strong, were not all tradition of all Churches for nearly thirteen centuries against it. Other instances of this abuse of Scripture argument are quoted in Mr. Newman’s work. The same was observed by Bp. Jewel, who in his “ reply to Dr. Cole,” (Works, p. 43.) thus puts a number of them together. “ Howbeit, of such reasons ye have store enough, as I were able to show you at large, if need so required. As where ye say :

Extra de	Quæ sunt potestates à Deo ordinatæ sunt :	The
Majoritate	powers that be are ordered by God :	
et obedi-	Ergo, The Pope is above the Emperor.	
entia.	Spiritualis à nemine judicatur :	The man that is
	ruled by God’s Spirit, is judged of no man :	
Cap. unam	Ergo, No man may judge the Pope.	
Sanctam.	Sancti estote, quoniam ego sanctus sum :	Be ye
	holy, for I am holy, saith the Lord :	
Innocentius	Ergo, No married man may be a Priest.	
dist. 82 Pro-	Christ said unto Peter, Solve pro me et te :	Pay
posuisti :	the tribute for me and thee :	
Roffensis	Ergo, the Pope is head of the Church.	
Durandus.	Ecclesiasticus saith, In medio ecclesiæ aperuit os	
	suum :	He opened his mouth in the midst of the
	congregation :	

the presence and infallible assistance of the Holy Spirit, the Romanist as promised to the Church, the Ultra-Protestant as promised to individuals¹.

	Ergo, The Priest must turn round at the midst of the Altar,
Concilium Nicenum Secundum sub Iren.	Fecit Deus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem suam: God made man to the image and likeness of Himself:
Concilium Basil. sub Eugenio.	Ergo, There must be images in the Church.
Concilium Rom. sub Silvestro.	Papa juratur in fidem Apostolicam: The Pope is sworn to the Apostles' faith:
The Canonists,	Ergo, The Church cannot err.
Durandus.	Non est discipulus supra magistrum: There is no scholar above his master:
Eckius.	Ergo, No man may judge the Pope.
Dr. Cole at Westminster.	Papa est dominus omnium beneficiorum: The Pope is Lord of all benefits:
	Ergo, He cannot commit simony, though he would.
	Domini est terra et plenitudo ejus: The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof:
	Ergo, The Communion cake must be made round.
	Omnis spiritus laudet Dominum: Let all spirits praise the Lord:"
	Ergo, Ye must have organs in the Church.
	Lac vobis potum dedi: or, Ignorantia est mater pietatis: I gave you milk to drink: or, Ignorance is the mother of devotion:
	Ergo, The people must make their prayers in a strange tongue."

¹ E. g. Mr. Scott, "Force of Truth," (v. fin.) thus vindicates his absolute certainty of the truth of the Calvinistic system—"Supposing this narration true, (for which the appeal is made to the heart-searching God,) and supposing the promises mentioned

(3) Both appeal (though Ultra-Protestants less now than formerly) to individual Fathers, when they make for them, and set them aside when against them¹. (4) Both will take one Father who sides with them, against the whole stream of Antiquity if against them. (5) Both hold, that the Spirit had reserved for these later times, what He denied to the earlier; that certain truth may now be arrived at, where the Ancient Church was in doubt and error²; only,

to be proposed to us, that we may embrace them, depend on them, and plead them in prayer, considering the glory of the Divine veracity as concerned in their accomplishment to every believer; let them try whether they can possibly evade one of these two conclusions—either that God hath failed of His promise, or that He hath in the main, and as far as is expressed, led the author by His Holy Spirit to the knowledge and belief of the truth.” In like way, “*Essays on the Church*,” p. 304.

¹ Thus Basnage (*Hist. des Eglises Réformées*, P. i. c. 6. § 4.) appeals to Clemens Romanus, in behalf of his view of justification by faith, supposing the truth to have been obscured or lost ever after in Christian Antiquity.

² See Mr. Newman on “Romanism.” So again Bp. Jewel, l. c. “It is a world, to consider the reason ye use to prove your purpose withal. For ye say, the Church in Christ’s and the Apostles’ time was but an infant; but now she is well-stricken in age, therefore she must be otherwise dieted now than she was then. This is not the handsomest comparison that I have heard of. For I never heard before now that Christ and His Apostles were called infants; or that ever any man before now took upon him to set them to school. *Esay* saith, that Christ should be *Pater futuri seculi*; that is, the Father of the world to come, which is the time of the Gospel. And St. Hierom, in your own Decrees, calleth the

again, the Romanist claims this enlarged illumination or inspiration to the Church; Ultra-Protestants to Individuals. (6) Both prefer what is modern to what is ancient, what is further from the source, to what is nearer. (7) Both deeply disparage Christian antiquity. And this agreement is not accidental, but arises from the same source in each, that each has to support modern corruptions of doctrine, unknown to Christian Antiquity, and therefore appeals against her and will not trust itself to her, as knowing beforehand that they will be condemned by her. And so it is scarcely uncharitable to suspect, that, beneath this professed and conscious dread, lest an appeal to tradition should give Rome an advantage, there lurks also a secret and unconscious or half-conscious dread for themselves: they have good reason to suspect, if they do not absolutely know, that Christian Antiquity is against them, and so they would anticipate the blow, by stifling it; they fear that her voice should be listened to, and so would drown it, by their outcries against her; and while they close the ear

Apostles, Patres, that is not infants, but the Fathers of the Church. And I believe, though ye would study and labour for it, yet would it be very hard for you, either to find out any good substantial reason, wherefore ye with your brethren ought to be called the Fathers of God's Church, or Christ and His Apostles ought to be called babes. O that ye would indifferently compare the one with the other! ye should find, that as like as ye and your Bishops are to the Apostles, so like is your Church to the Apostles' Church."

against her, as if she would give witness for Rome, which she would not give, they hope to escape hearing the testimony which she would give against the Anti-sacramental system of Geneva.

But this is an alarming course, and the irreverential spirit in which it is begun, bodes but ill of its termination. It were an ungrateful task, were any to set themselves systematically to show that Christian Antiquity were not to be trusted; yet this would require patience and research; but what must one think of the piety and reverence, which would make sport with the supposed defects of the Fathers of the Church, and discover their father's shame; which would repeat from mouth to mouth the one or other saying, which themselves had first misunderstood and distorted, in order triumphantly to ask, what could be thought of the judgment of men who could so speak? Truly, it seems like the Philistines making sport with the mighty man whose eyes they had first put out, and likely to meet with their end. It was scarcely in so irreverential, but in the same sceptical spirit, that Semler, the parent of German Neology, began unravelling the belief of his country: but the criticism of the Fathers mounted up to the criticism of the Apostles; and the criticism of the Apostles to that of their LORD; and the disbelief in their LORD is in its last stage become a dethroning of GOD, and a setting up of self, a Pantheism which worships GOD as enshrined in self.

This subject, upon which I have detained your

Lordship so long, may also, as the first instance of the supposed Romanist tendency of some principles of our great Divines, illustrate how mistaken is the ground of these vague fears. Opposed errors will often meet: truth will not approximate to either, though if looked upon on either side, it will seem to be nearer to the opposite than these are to each other. The proverbial truth tells us "extremes meet," as in this case also is verified; whereas the mean which our Church holds will never meet with either extreme; they parted off from it; and however slight the original divergence, become more and more widely separated from it, and never again join. To a careless or superficial thinker, the mean seems likely to join the extreme, because it has in it some quality which is wanting to the other extreme; but it is not so; it agrees with the extreme, not in essentials, but in something incidental; the rash man appears to have one quality in common with the brave one, in that he exposes himself to danger; the brave man's caution may readily appear like cowardice; and so the rash thinks the brave cowardly, and the coward holds him to be rash; whereas the exposing himself to danger or no, is but an accident; the principle on which he does it, or refrains from it, is that which constitutes his character; he then will neither be rash nor cowardly; but the coward will be rash, and the rash will be cowardly, if emergencies so determine. Prodigality and avarice seem to be contraries; yet are they continually united, as in Catiline, "*alieni appe-*

“ *tens, sui profusus* :” he who is simply liberal, will be neither, though by either extreme he will be confounded with the other. “Extremes meet,” because they proceed on no settled principle, but on passion ; they are guided by no internal rules, but are blown about, this way or that, by the force of outward circumstances ; the mean goes on fixed principles, and therefore holds on an even course, undeviating and therefore never approximating to either extreme. And so our English Church has by the Church of Rome been confounded with Ultra-Protestants, and by Ultra-Protestants has ever been thought to approximate to Rome. In the present instance, it is but accident that Rome appeals to Antiquity, or Ultra-Protestantism to Scripture ; both have an ulterior object, to maintain their own system ; but Romanism will found its errors on Scripture, or will disparage Christian Antiquity with Ultra-Protestantism. And Ultra-Protestantism, in its turn, will neglect the plain meaning of Scripture, or appeal to Christian Antiquity, to establish views formed independently of Antiquity ; whereas the genuine English system, being founded on Holy Scripture as interpreted by Christian Antiquity, possesses a deep reverence for Scripture as the source of the Faith, and for Antiquity, as its witness and expositor ; and appealing to both, for the office assigned to them by Him who gave them, has only so much in common with either extreme that it holds the truth which they have perverted, but approximates in no way to their errors.

Art. XI. *Of the justification of Man.*

“Justification” having been lately the subject of a very elaborate and meditative work by one ¹ of those accused of departing from the Articles, it is the less necessary to trouble your Lordship with any lengthened detail upon it. Had they, who bring charges, studied and mastered it, they might have been benefited by it, and these charges been spared. The XIth Article bears the appearance, on its very face, of being a protest against Romish error; it does not pretend to embrace in a few lines the whole subject of justification; it contents itself with securing one main point; it puts in strong contrast the merits of CHRIST and the merits of man, and says, that we are justified solely for the sake of His merit, and not for our own works and deservings; and that merit, it further says, is made available to us through faith. “We are accounted righteous before God, only *for* “the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ *by* “Faith, and not *for* our own works or deservings. “Wherefore that we are justified by Faith only, is a “most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, “as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Jus- “tification.” The Article, then, opposes the merit of CHRIST to any thing which we have of our own, to “our own works and deservings,” as the *meritorious* cause of salvation; and thus far, we believe, little is

¹ Mr. Newman's Lectures on Justification.

imputed to us. It is so plain a truth, and has been so often inculcated by us, that every sin of man which is remitted, is remitted only for the sake of His meritorious Cross and Passion, every good and acceptable work is such through His power working in us, that little, I believe, has thus far been objected. The objections have been founded not on the Article, but on men's inferences from it. The Article opposes "Faith" as the origin of our justification, to works; it excludes works from being any meritorious cause of justification; "faith only" means in its language "faith, not works." A modern school has very strangely extended the reference of the Article, and opposed man's faith to the Sacrament of His LORD. They say, "faith only" means, that Faith,—as opposed to every thing else, not works only, but Baptism,—is *the* channel whereby the merits of CHRIST are conveyed to the soul to its justification.

But, my Lord, such a contrast was plainly neither in the minds of the writers of the Article, nor is it in their words; the whole subject of Baptism was altogether foreign to that which is handled in *this* whole series of articles on the relation of faith to works, before and after justification; (ix—xvii.) the writers specify what they do mean; they exclude man's works; they refer every thing to the merits of CHRIST: "by faith only" excludes, then, man's works, not any thing which is not man's. Whether He be pleased to convey justification directly to the believer's soul, or through His own ordinance of Bap-

tism, is wholly foreign to their subject. They say nothing about it one way or other, as neither had they any occasion, since the questions which have so agitated us of late, as to the efficacy of Baptism, had not then been raised in our Church. Neither again does the Article say any thing about the means whereby man is retained in a justified state, nor wherein our justification consists; so that it may be perfectly true, that we are "justified by faith only," as the means whereby *we* receive it, and yet through Baptism as the means or channel, through which GOD conveys it; or "by the Spirit" as the sanctifying Presence which makes us acceptable in GOD's sight; or "by works," as St. James says, as that by which the Justification is continued on in us; or, as it has lately been very concisely and clearly expressed¹, "Justification comes *through* the Sacraments; is received *by* faith, *consists* in God's inward Presence, and *lives* in obedience."

The same is in part expressed by one who was in his day a pillar of our Church against heresy². "The merits of Christ *applied in* Baptism *by the Spirit*, and *received by a lively faith*, complete our justification for the time being." As well then might it be inferred that "justification by faith only" excluded the indwelling of the Spirit, on its first imparting,

¹ Newman on Justification, lect. 12. "Faith viewed relatively to rites and works," p. 318.

² Waterland on Justification, quoted by Mr. Newman, p. 154, note.

or good works as necessary to its continuance, as that it excludes Baptism as the channel whereby God bestows it. Whatever charge then is conceived to lie against this view will equally hold against the earlier Non-conformists¹, who had not reduced Justification to a mere imputation, but regarded it as resulting from the indwelling of the Spirit. In Mr. Newman's words², on the relation of Justification by faith to Justification by works, "If indeed I said that works "justify in *the same sense* as faith only justifies, this "would be a contradistinction in terms; but faith "only may justify in one sense, good works in another, "and this is all that is here maintained. After all, "does not Christ only justify? How is it that the "doctrine of faith justifying does not interfere with "our Lord's being the sole justifier? It will of "course be replied, that our Lord is the meritorious "cause, and faith the means; that faith justifies in "a different and subordinate sense. As then Christ "justifies *in the sense* in which He justifies, alone, "yet faith also justifies in its own sense, so works, "whether moral or ritual, may justify us in their "own respective senses, though in the sense in which "faith justifies it only justifies.—Indeed, is not this "argument, as has been suggested already, the very "weapon of the Arians in their warfare against the "Son of God? They said, Christ is not God, be-

¹ *E. g.* Baxter quoted by Mr. Newman, l. c.

² Lect. xii. "Faith viewed relatively to Rites and Works," p. 316.

“ cause the Father is called the *only* God.” And again : “ The instrumental power of Faith cannot “ interfere with the instrumental power of Baptism ; “ because Faith is the *sole* justifier, not in contrast “ to all means and agencies whatever (for it is not “ surely in contrast to our Lord’s merits, or God’s “ mercy), but to all other *graces*. When, then, “ Faith is called the sole instrument, this means the “ sole *internal* instrument, not the sole instrument of “ any kind.

“ There is nothing inconsistent, then, in Faith “ being the sole instrument of justification, and yet “ Baptism also the sole instrument, and that at the “ same time, because in distinct senses ; an inward “ instrument in no way interfering with an outward “ instrument ¹.”

And this connection of Justification with Baptism, so far from being at variance with the homily to which the Article refers, and which men now quote in behalf of a contrary view, is implied by its very outset. For in the first words it lays down the necessity man has of a justification out of himself, which is what the Article requires. “ Because all “ men be sinners and offenders against God, and “ breakers of His law and commandment, therefore “ can no man by his own acts, works, and deeds “ (seem they never so good) be justified, and made “ righteous before God ; but every man of necessity

¹ Lect. x. “ Justification by Faith only,” p. 259.

“ is constrained to seek for another righteousness or
 “ justification to be received at God’s own hands,
 “ that is to say, the forgiveness of his sins and tres-
 “ passes, in such things as he hath offended.” Then
 it speaks of this justification as being bestowed by
 GOD, and received by faith. “ And this justification
 “ or righteousness which we so receive of God’s
 “ mercy and Christ’s merits, *embraced by faith*, is taken,
 “ accepted, and allowed of God, for our perfect and
 “ full justification.” And then, having named the
 Sacrifice of CHRIST as the *meritorious* cause of our
 justification, the writer proceeds: “ Insomuch that
 “ infants, being baptized and dying in their infancy,
 “ are by this Sacrifice washed from their sins, brought
 “ to God’s favour, and made His children and in-
 “ heritors of His kingdom of heaven. And they
 “ which in act or deed do sin after their Baptism,
 “ when they turn again to God unfeignedly, they are
 “ likewise washed by this Sacrifice from their sins, in
 “ such sort that there remaineth not any spot of sin,
 “ that shall be imputed to their damnation.” “ Here,”
 observes Mr. Newman ¹, “ is distinct mention of faith
 “ justifying *after* Baptism, but no mention of its jus-
 “ tifying *before* Baptism; on the contrary, Baptism
 “ is expressly said to effect the first justification.”
 “ The writer proceeds: ‘ *This* is that justification or
 “ righteousness which St. Paul speaks of, when he
 “ saith, No man is justified by the works of the

¹ Lect. x. “ Justification by Faith only,” p. 263.

“Law, but freely by faith in Jesus Christ.’ So it
 “seems that St. Paul too, when he speaks of justifi-
 “cation through faith, speaks of faith as subordinate
 “to Baptism, not as the immediate initiation into a
 “justified state.”

So again Dr. Heylin¹ sums up this same state-
 ment of the homily: “There we find, that by God’s
 “mercy and the virtue of that Sacrifice which our
 “High Priest and Saviour Christ Jesus, the Son
 “of God, once offered for us upon the Cross, we do
 “obtain God’s Grace and remission as well of our
 “original sin in Baptism, as of all actual sin com-
 “mitted by us after Baptism, if we truly repent and
 “turn unfeignedly unto Him again. Which doctrine
 “of the Church of England, as it is consonant to the
 “word of God in Holy Scripture, so is it also most
 “agreeable to the common and received judgment
 “of pure antiquity.”

The doctrine of Justification through Baptism is
 not opposed then to Justification by Faith only, in the
 sense of the Article, although it is to the theory
 which some have constructed upon it. “The neces-
 “sity of Baptism,” says Bishop Bull², “and of those
 “things which prepare for Baptism, in order to
 “obtain remission of sins, which is set forth in
 “sundry places of Scripture, and occurs in almost

¹ On the Apostles’ Creed, Art. x. c. vi. quoted in *Catena Patrum*, No. ii. Tracts, No. 76. “Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration,” p. 26.

² *Apol. pro Harmon.* S. 4. § 9.

“ every page of the Ancients, is alone a sufficient
 “ argument to overthrow *that* solifidianism, which
 “ many have attempted to build up out of Holy
 “ Scripture and the testimonies of the Fathers ; as
 “ our most learned and pious Thorndike, of blessed
 “ memory, has evinced in different places of his writ-
 “ ings. For it appears hence, that faith by itself
 “ does not suffice to obtain justification ; but that
 “ outward Baptism is required besides, when it may
 “ be had ; but that at all events that promise of
 “ a new life, which is wont to be made at Baptism ;
 “ is of necessity required ;” and, again¹, “ In the
 “ New Testament, John Baptist is said to have been
 “ sent by God, ‘ to preach the baptism of repentance
 “ to the remission of sins,’ where are set down
 “ together the end and the means leading thereto ;
 “ the end is remission of sins or justification ; the
 “ means our Baptism and repentance.”

There is, however, another wide difference between
 the views which we have inherited from, “ to say the
 least, the greater number of English Divines,” and
 those now held by a large portion of the Church,
 resulting from our different views of the connection
 of justification with Baptism. The view prevalent
 with this class appears to have been borrowed from
 Luther, and so to be nearly that condemned by the
 Council of Trent, that “ Justifying² faith is nothing

¹ Ib. S. 3. § 12.

² Sess. 6. can. 12.

“ else than a reliance (*fiducia*) on the Divine mercy
 “ remitting sins for Christ’s sake, or that it is this
 “ reliance alone whereby we are justified.” The Tri-
 dentine doctrine on the contrary is, that “ Justifica-
 “ tion is not merely the remission of sins, but also
 “ the sanctification and renewal of the inward man
 “ by his voluntary reception of grace and gifts.
 “ Whence a man becomes righteous for unrighteous,
 “ a friend [of God] for an enemy, so as to be an heir
 “ according to the hope of eternal life, and the com-
 “ munication of the merits of the Passion of our
 “ Lord Jesus Christ. This takes place in the very
 “ act of the justification of the ungodly, in that,
 “ through the merit of His most Holy Passion, the
 “ love of God is through the Holy Spirit shed abroad
 “ in the hearts of those who are justified, and becomes
 “ inherent in them, whence in the very act of justi-
 “ fication, man, together with the remission of sins,
 “ receives infused into him, through Jesus Christ, in
 “ Whom he is engrafted, faith, hope, and charity.”
 The Anglican doctrine¹, or that which we conceive to
 have been the teaching of the majority of our Church,
 differs from both these: from the Roman, in that it
 excludes sanctification from having any place in our
 justification; from the Lutheran, in that it conceives
 justification to be not imputation merely, but the act
 of God imparting His Divine Presence to the soul,
 through Baptism, and so making us temples of the

¹ Sess. 6. cap. 7.

Holy Ghost, “the¹ habitation in us of God the Father, and the Word incarnate through the Holy Ghost:” or to quote a fuller passage², “It may be remarked that whatever blessings in detail we ascribe to justification, are ascribed in Scripture to this sacred indwelling. For instance, is justification *remission of sins*? the Gift of the Spirit conveys it, as is evident from the Scripture doctrine about Baptism; ‘One Baptism for the remission of sins.’ Is justification *adoption* into the family of God? in like manner the Spirit is expressly called the Spirit of adoption, ‘the Spirit whereby we cry, Abba, Father.’ Is justification *reconciliation* with God? St. Paul says, ‘Jesus Christ is *in* you, unless ye be reprobates.’ Is justification *life*? the same Apostle says, ‘Christ liveth *in* me.’ Is justification given to *faith*? he also prays ‘that Christ may dwell in’ Christians’ ‘hearts by faith.’ Does justification lead to holy *obedience*? Our Lord assures us that ‘he that abideth in Him and He in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit.’ Is it through justification that we rejoice *in hope of the glory* of God? in like manner ‘Christ in us’ is said to be ‘the hope of glory.’”

The three views of doctrine part widely in their practical effects; the Lutheran³ view, especially as

¹ Newman on Justif. Lect. 6. “On the gift of Righteousness,” p. 160.

² *Ib.* p. 166, 7.

³ The Council of Trent condemns those who hold “that it is

developed in the Wesleyans and a section of our Church, leads men to look to their own *feelings*, as that by which their reliance on Christ may be ascertained, to analyze them, operate upon them, work them up, rely at last with satisfaction upon them, as tests of their love for CHRIST. They have been taught that justification is not the gift of GOD through His Sacraments, but the result of a certain frame of mind, of a going forth of themselves, and resting themselves upon their Saviour; this is the *act* whereby they think themselves to have been justified; and so, as another would revert to his Baptism, and his engrafting into Christ, and his thus being *in* Christ, so do they to this act whereby *they* were justified; they cherish their then feelings, not to act upon them, but for their own sakes; mourn over their fading¹; endeavour to reproduce them; make their Christian life to concentrate in them; and lose out of sight, as carnal and legal, its ordinary, hourly duties. These tendencies, doubtless, are checked in individuals; but whatever checks

necessary to every man to obtain remission of sins, that he should believe assuredly and without any doubt, that the sins of his own infirmity and indisposition are remitted to him," and "that a man is thereby absolved from sins and justified, that he believes assuredly that he is absolved and justified, and that no one is truly justified, unless he believes that he is justified, and that by *this* faith alone absolution and justification are perfected." (Sess. 6. Can. 13, 14.) which is just the Wesleyan doctrine.

¹ This feeling is encouraged in popular hymns, irregularly admitted into our Churches, as in that, "Oh for a closer walk with

there are, are the result of past duty, of an implanted integrity, of God's law within them, in despite of their system. Their tendency is to act upon a theory, not upon Scripture; to suppose that if the feelings be right, the acts will, as a matter of course, be right; and so to neglect that about which Scripture bids them be diligent. To take the most systematic developement of this theory; the first thought which occurs to the mind of a Wesleyan, in speaking of his spiritual state, is, not what temptations he has surmounted, or failed in, what duties he has neglected, or performed, but, what were his feelings? His "experience" concentrates in these.

"True faith," observes Mr. Newman¹, "is what

"God." What a strong contrast with the peace resulting from continued growth in grace are such lines as :

Where is the happiness I knew
When first I knew the Lord;
 And felt the heart-reviving view
 Of Jesus and His word?
 What peaceful hours I *then* enjoyed!
 How sweet their memory still!
 But *now* I feel a painful void
 No human joys can fill.

Such lines would describe truly a backsliding Christian, or a dejected one, who had been taught to make his feelings the test of his state; but they are too likely to make one think himself backsliding, because his feelings are not what they were. The more practical view is given in Mr. Newman's Sermons, vol. i. "On the use of excited feelings in religion."

¹ On Justification, Lect. 13. "On preaching the Gospel," p. 385.

“ may be called colourless, like air or water; it is
“ but the medium through which the soul sees
“ Christ; and the soul as little really rests upon it
“ and contemplates it, as the eye can see the air.
“ When, then, men are bent on holding it (as it
“ were) in their hands, curiously inspecting, analyz-
“ ing, and so aiming at it, they are obliged to colour
“ and thicken it, that it may be seen and touched.
“ That is, they substituted for it, something or other,
“ a feeling, notion, sentiment, conviction, or act of
“ reason, which they may hang over and dote upon.
“ They rather aim at experiences (as they are called)
“ within them, than at Him that is without them.
“ They are led to enlarge upon the signs of conver-
“ sion, the variations of their feelings, their aspira-
“ tions and longings, and to tell all this to others;—
“ to tell others how they fear, and hope, and sin,
“ and rejoice, and renounce themselves, and rest in
“ Christ only; how conscious they are that they are
“ but ‘filthy rags,’ and all is of grace, till in fact they
“ have little time left them to guard against what
“ they are condemning, and to exercise what they
“ seem to themselves to be so full of. Now men in
“ a battle are brief-spoken; they realize their situa-
“ tion and are intent upon it. By-standers
“ see our minds; but our minds, if healthy, see but
“ the objects which possess them. As God’s grace
“ elicits our faith, so His holiness stirs our fear, and
“ His glory kindles our love. Others may say of
“ us ‘here is faith’ and ‘there is conscientiousness’

“and ‘there is love,’ but we can only say, ‘this is God’s grace,’ and ‘that is His holiness,’ and ‘that is His glory.’”

Just the reverse of this is the Romanist. His theory leads men as naturally to look chiefly to their works, and as it has a Pelagian *tendency* (although it has been held together with high Augustinian doctrine) so may it readily lead them to look to their own works as their own; to weigh them, balance them, evil against good, make the one compensate for the other, settle their several values; at last, hold the ALMIGHTY their debtor, as if the more eminent saints had a supererogation of merits. “It makes,” to use Mr. Newman’s¹ words, “its heavenly grace a matter of purchase and trade.” “Romanism,” as he again says², “by its pretence of Infallibility, lowers the standard and quality of Gospel obedience, as well as impairs its mysterious and sacred character; and this in various ways. When religion is reduced in all its parts to a system, there is hazard of something earthly being made the chief object of our contemplation instead of our Maker. Now Romanism classifies our duties and their rewards, the things to do, the modes of pleasing God, the penalties and the remedies of sin, with such exactness, that an indi-

¹ On Justification, lect. 8. “Righteousness viewed as a gift and as a quality,” p. 221.

² On Romanism, &c. lect. 3. “Doctrine of Infallibility morally considered,” p. 125.

“vidual knows (so to speak) just where he is upon his
“journey heavenward, how far he is got, how much
“he has to pass, and his duties become a matter of
“calculation. It provides us with a sort of graduated
“scale of devotion and obedience, and engrosses our
“thoughts with the details of a mere system, to a
“comparative forgetfulness of its professed Author.
“But it is evident that the purest religious services
“are those which are done, not by constraint, but
“voluntarily, as a free offering to Almighty God.—
“True faith does not like to realize to itself what
“it does; it throws off the thought of it; it is
“carried on and reaches forward towards perfection,
“not counting the steps it has ascended, but keep-
“ing the end steadily in its eye, knowing only that
“it is advancing, and glorying in each sacrifice or
“service which it is allowed to offer, as it occurs,
“not remembering it afterwards. But in Romanism
“there would seem to be little room for this uncon-
“scious devotion. Each deed has its price, every
“quarter of the land of promise is laid down and
“described. Roads are carefully marked out, and
“such as would attain to perfection are constrained
“to move in certain lines, as if there were a science
“of gaining heaven. Thus the Saints are cut off
“from the Christian multitude by certain fixed
“duties, not rising out of it by the continuous
“growth and flowing forth of services which in their
“substance pertain to all men. And Christian holi-
“ness in consequence, loses its freshness, vigour, and

“ comeliness, being frozen (as it were) into certain
 “ attitudes, which are not graceful except when un-
 “ studied.

“ The injury resulting to the multitude from the
 “ same circumstance, is of a different but not less
 “ serious nature. While, of those who aim at the
 “ more perfect obedience, many are made self-satisfied,
 “ and still morè formal, the mass of Christians are
 “ either discouraged from attempting or countenanced
 “ in neglecting it. If, indeed, there is one offence
 “ more than the rest characteristic of Romanism, it
 “ is this, its indulging the carnal tastes of the mul-
 “ titude of men, setting a limit to their necessary
 “ obedience, and absolving them from the duty of
 “ sacrificing their whole lives to God.”

The Anglican doctrine directs men to look neither to their faith nor their works, but to CHRIST alone, “ the Author and Finisher of their faith,” not staying to analyze their feelings, nor weighing their works in a balance, as if claiming Heaven either by faith or works, but looking simply to Him, striving to follow Him, to do as He bids; to act as He guides; to look off from things behind, to press forward to things before, as having Him ever before our eyes, Whose Goodness and Greatness and Holiness and Glory are immeasurable, yet Who bade us follow in His steps, and “ in Whom instrengthening” (*ἐνδυναμοῦντι*), because indwelling, St. Paul “ could do all things;” “ Who¹ is our Righteousness, by

¹ Newman on Justif. lect. 6. “ on the gift of righteousness,” p. 167.

“ dwelling in us by the Spirit ; justifies us by entering
 “ into us ; continues to justify us by remaining in us.
 “ This is really and truly our justification, not faith,
 “ not holiness, [with the Romanist] not (much less)
 “ a mere imputation [with the Lutheran] but through
 “ God’s mercy, the very Presence of Christ.”

I would not be understood to rest the defence of any doctrine, in any degree, upon its apparent tendencies ; we are not judges of them, and might readily mistake them ; and certainly should, if we would on any such *à priori* grounds decide doctrines to be scriptural or unscriptural ; yet, being persuaded that this doctrine is both Scriptural and Catholic, we may speak of its tendencies, with a view to abate a prejudice against it. And in this view the writer so often quoted contrasts it with those of Romanism and Ultra-Protestantism.

“ I say¹ the view of justification taken by Roman-
 “ ists and by a school of divines among ourselves,
 “ tends to fix the mind on self, not on Christ, whereas
 “ that which I have advocated as Scriptural and
 “ Catholic, buries self in the absorbing vision of a
 “ present, an indwelling God. And as so doing, it
 “ is a more awakening and fearful doctrine even than
 “ that mode of teaching which insists mainly and di-
 “ rectly on our responsibilities and duties. For to
 “ what does it point as the great and immediate con-
 “ dition of justification ? to faith and holiness of our

¹ Lect. 8. “ Righteousness viewed as a gift and a quality,”
 p. 220.

“ own? or, on the other hand, to the mere title of
 “ righteousness, which cannot be literally approached
 “ or profaned by us? no,—but to the glorious She-
 “ kinah of the Word Incarnate, as to the true wed-
 “ ding garment in which the soul must be dressed.
 “ Does not such a view far increase, instead of di-
 “ minishing our responsibilities? does it not make us
 “ more watchful and more obedient, while it comforts
 “ and transports us? Surely it takes our minds off
 “ ourselves in order to fill us with triumph, awe, and
 “ godly fear at what we are and what we hold within
 “ us. When are we the more likely to dread sinning,
 “ when we know merely we ought to dread it, or
 “ when we see the exceeding peril of it? When are
 “ we the more likely to keep awake and be sober,
 “ when we have a present treasure now to lose, or a
 “ distant reward to gain? Is it not more dreadful,
 “ when evil thoughts assail us, more elevating and
 “ ennobling in affliction, more kindling in danger
 “ and hardship, to reflect (if the words may be said),
 “ that we bear God within us, as the Martyr Ignatius
 “ expresses it, that He is grieved by us or suffers
 “ with us according as we carry or renounce His
 “ Cross,—I say, has not this thought more of per-
 “ suasiveness in it to do and suffer for Him than the
 “ views of doctrine which have spread among us? Is
 “ it not more constraining than that which considers
 “ that the Gospel comes to us in name, not in power;
 “ deeper, and more sacred than a second, which
 “ makes its heavenly grace a matter of purchase and

“ trade ; more glowing than a third, which depresses
 “ it almost to the chill temperature of natural re-
 “ ligious ?”

I cannot refrain from adding one more passage, in which he winds up his glowing rehearsal of the devotions of the early Christians whose life was faith, and their faith, not a speculation, but their life :

“ They¹ had Christ before them ; His thought in
 “ their minds, His emblems in their eye, His Name
 “ in their mouths, His service in their postures, mag-
 “ nifying Him, and calling on all that lives to magnify
 “ Him, joining with angels in heaven and saints in pa-
 “ radise to bless and praise Him for ever and ever. O
 “ great and noble system, not of the Jews who rested
 “ in their rites and privileges, not of Christians who
 “ are taken up with their own feelings, and who de-
 “ scribe what they should exhibit, but of the true
 “ Saints of God, the undefiled and virgin souls who
 “ follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth ! Such
 “ is the difference between those whom Christ praises
 “ and those whom He condemns or warns. The Pha-
 “ risee recounted the signs of God’s mercy upon and
 “ in him ; the Publican simply looked to God. The
 “ young Ruler boasted of his correct life, but the
 “ penitent woman anointed Jesus’ feet and kissed
 “ them ; nay, holy Martha herself, spoke of her
 “ ‘ much service ;’ while Mary waited on Him for
 “ the ‘ one thing needful.’ The one thought of them-

¹ Lect. 13. “ On Preaching the Gospel,” p. 388.

“ selves ; the others thought of Christ. To look at
 “ Christ is to be justified by faith ; to think of being
 “ justified by faith is to look from Christ and to fall
 “ from grace. He who worships Christ and works
 “ for Him is acting that doctrine which another does
 “ but enunciate ; his worship and his works are acts
 “ of faith, and avail to his salvation, because he does
 “ not do them *as* availing.”

Art. XVI. *Of sin after Baptism.*

From this difference in the view of Justification, it could not be, but that there should be a material difference as to the view of sin after Baptism. And the charges on this subject relate simply to myself. Some, I believe, have gone so far as to imply that I contravene the Article, although I prefaced what I said with a statement in its very words ; others allege only that my statements interfere, according to their view, with the doctrine of justification by faith. And this could not be otherwise. For in that they sever Justification from Baptism, and make it to consist in the “ *act* of reliance upon the merits of CHRIST only,” sin, according to them, is forgiven, *at once*, upon each renewal of this act : and in that they thus virtually substitute this act for Baptism, a man has thereupon no more to do with his past sins, than, according to the doctrine of the Church, he has with those remitted by Baptism. Since, moreover, they identify this act with Justification, then a man’s justification is renewed, so often as this act is renewed :

and if any one denies that a man is *forthwith* completely justified, it is, with them, all one with denying that he is "justified by faith only." I say this, by way of explaining how one who takes this view of justification must, if he judge another by his principles, do him injustice unintentionally; he cannot understand how our own merits and deservings are not introduced into the act of justification. On the other hand, according to our Church, we are by Baptism brought into a state of salvation, or justification (for the words are thus far equivalent), a state into which we were brought of God's free mercy alone, without works, but in which having been placed, we are to "work out our own salvation with fear and trembling," through the indwelling Spirit of "God, working in us to will and to do of His good pleasure;" a *state* admitting of degrees, according to the degree of sanctification; (although the first *act*, whereby we were brought into it, did not) a state admitting of relapses and recoveries, but which is weakened by every relapse; injured by lesser, destroyed for the time by grievous, sin; and after such sin recovered with difficulty, in proportion to the greatness of the sin, and the degree of its wilfulness, and of the grace withstood.

Now all this does not lie within the scope of the Article; the Article expressly condemns persons holding two opposite errors, "those which say they can no more sin as long as they live here," and "those who deny the place of forgiveness to such as

truly repent." But who "*truly* repent;" what are helps towards *true* repentance; when a man, who has been guilty of "deadly sin wilfully committed after Baptism," may be satisfied that he is truly repentant for it; whether and to what degree he should, all his life after, continue his repentance for it; whether he be altogether pardoned, or whether only so long as he continue in a state of penitence; wherein his penitence should consist; whether continued repentance would efface the traces of his sin in himself; whether he might ever in this life look upon himself as restored to the state in which he had been, had he not committed it; whether it affect the degree of his future bliss, or its effects be effaced by his repentance, but their extinction depend upon the continued greatness of his repentance; whether cessation of his active repentance may not bring back degrees of the sin upon him; whether it shall appear again in the day of judgment; these, and the like, are questions upon which the Article does not speak, but upon which a modern popular theology has decided very peremptorily, and will have no interference with its decrees. According to it, the whole office of repentance is to bring men to CHRIST, the terrors of the law are to drive men to dread the punishment due to their sins, to renounce them, to seek for reconciliation through the free mercy of CHRIST; and so far is, of course, true; but when men have thus been brought to "lay hold of His saving merits," then, according to them, their sins

are done away; they "are covered¹;" they can appear no more; "the handwriting is blotted out;" a man has no more to do with them than to thank CHRIST that he has been delivered from them. This "apprehension of Christ's merits" is to them instead of Baptism, a full remission of sins, completely effacing them; and so often as any man embraces those merits, so often, according to them, are his sins effaced. To revert to past sin, is to doubt of CHRIST's mercy; to bear a painful recollection of it, is to be under the bondage of the law; to seek to efface it by repentance, is weakness of faith; to do acts of mercy, or self-denial, or self-abasement, or to fast, with reference to it, is to interfere with the "freeness and fulness of the Gospel;" to insist upon them, is "to place repentance in stead of Christ." This system has but two topics, "repent and believe the Gospel;" and so far right; but these two so narrowed, that repentance is to precede faith, faith to supersede repentance. Other offices of repentance, it scarcely entertains in thought, except to denounce or to scoff at².

It was against this system my Lord, that I spoke: this abuse of the doctrine of justification by faith is searing men's consciences now, as much as the "indulgences" of the Romish system did before. It used to be said that "the Romish was an easy re-

¹ Ps. xxxii. 2.

² *E. g.* in the way in which certain acts of self-discipline instanced from Bp. Taylor, in Tract 66, p. 8, have been jeered at.

ligion to die in ;” but even the Romish, in its corruptions, scarcely offered terms so easy, at all events made not a boast of the easiness of its terms ; if it had but the dregs of the system of the ancient Church, stale and unprofitable as these often were, they had yet something of the strength or the bitterness of the ancient medicine : they at least, testified to a system, when men made sacrifices for the good of their souls, humbled themselves in dust and ashes ; practised self-discipline ; “ accused ¹ and condemned “ themselves, that so they might find mercy at their “ heavenly Father’s hand for Christ’s sake, and not “ be accused and condemned in that fearful judgment ;” felt “ the remembrance” of their past sins to be “ grievous ² unto” them, “ the burthen” to be “ intolerable ;” “ were grieved and wearied with the burthen of their sins ;” “ turned ³ to God in weeping, “ fasting and praying ;” “ bewailed ³ and lamented their “ sinful life, acknowledged and confessed their offences, and sought to bring forth worthy fruits of “ penance ;” and in cases of notorious sin, were “ put ³ “ to open penance, and punished in this world that “ their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord.” The sun of the ancient Church was setting, sadly obscured by the mists and vapours of earth which had gathered round it ; yet it did occasionally gleam through on the eye, which watched constantly for it

¹ Visitation of the Sick.

² Communion Service.

³ Commination Service.

behind those mists; and even to these clouds which half hid it, it imparted oftentimes its own, though a melancholy, lustre. Romanism was, in practice as well as in doctrine, decayed; yet to those who "loved the stones, and pitied the dust" of the ancient city of God, its very ruins marked the outline, which they might trace out for themselves: treasures were buried there for those, who would clear away the heaps, which decay accumulated over them. To the many, her's was a debasing system, yet there might be, and was often, reality in it, to those who would find it.

The refined distinctions, which she made in carrying out her divisions of mortal and venial sins; her accurate allotment of punishments, (as if she could measure out the degree of guilt contracted by each offence against God); her inventions of attrition and contrition; the assumption of an absolute power to remit altogether venial, and the eternal consequences of mortal sins; not to speak now of the sale¹ of indulgences or the commutation of penance for money; these favoured the corruptions of carnal men², stifled

¹ The *sale* of indulgences was prohibited by the Council of Trent (Sess. xxi. c. 9. de reformat.) "that all might *at length* truly understand that these heavenly treasures of the Church were employed not for gain but for piety," and the extent of previous corruptions admitted; their use, as a means of power, is continued. See quotations in Mr. Newman, on Romanism, lect. 4. "Doctrine of Infallibility politically considered," p. 145. ed. 2.

² See more fully Newman on Romanism, lect. 3. "Doctrine of Infallibility morally considered," p. 113, sqq. ed. 2.

the misgivings which might awaken them from their security, lowered the tone and standard, whereat they were to aim, and threw them on the Church, to whom the dispensation of those treasures of mercy were committed, rather than on Him, in whose Name she dispensed them. She took upon herself the office of the Judge, anticipated His sentence, and stood in His place. Such were the effects of her portion of it, its corruptions; but insomuch as she retained from Antiquity, the system bore witness to the holiness of God; the grievousness of offending Him; the “earnestness, indignation, fear, vehement longing, zeal, revenge,” which the Apostle¹ says “godly sorrow worketh;” it spoke of holier times and holier practices than it realised or encouraged, to those who had ears to hear. But this modern system, whose very boast it is to make works of no account²; which teaches people, on their deathbed, after a life of profligacy and infamy, servants of sin and Satan, destroying, as far as in them lay, the souls of others, to put away all painful remembrance of past sin, and to exult and triumph in having cast away “their righteousnesses” (which they had not) “like filthy rags,”

¹ 2 Cor. vii. 10, 11.

² Thus a very popular and in many respects valuable account of the destruction of a vessel, speaking of the apparent conversion of some, under the immediate prospect of sudden death, appealed strongly to this proof of the value of faith without works. “What,” it said, “would they have done, who make salvation depend in any degree upon works in such a case, when there was no time to perform them?”

and to joy as though they had "fought the good fight," and been approved soldiers; which would make it, practically easier, and safer almost, to be saved without works than with them, speaking often of the danger of relying upon works, and but little of the danger of being lost for want of them; which stifles continually the strong emotions of terror and amazement which GOD has wrought upon the soul, and "healing slightly the wound" which He has made, makes it often incurable; which makes peace rather than holiness, the end of its ministrations, and by an artificial wrought-up peace, checks the deep and searching agony, whereby GOD, as in a furnace of fire, was purifying the whole man, "by the Spirit of judgment, and by the Spirit of burning"—this is altogether a spurious system, misapplying the promises of the Gospel, usurping the privileges of Baptism, which it has not to confer, giving peace which it has not to bestow, and going counter to the whole tenor of Scripture, that "every man shall be judged according to his works."

This system, however it differs from Romanism in the means, agrees with it in the end, in lulling the conscience, ridding man, (as he craves to be,) of all anxieties as to his past life, permitting him to forget his past sins; and that, without exercising the self-discipline, which Romanism, when not altogether corrupt, still encourages.

Our Church, my Lord, here as elsewhere, appears to me to hold a distinct line, however she has not

been able as yet to revive the "godly discipline" which she feelingly deploras. Romanism, as well as Ultra-Protestantism, practically frees a man from his past sins; our Church bids him confess that he is "tied¹ and bound with the chain" of them, and to pray Him that "the pitifulness of His great mercy may loose us;" she teaches us, in her daily service, to have our "sins *ever* before us" that so GOD may "hide His face from our sins, and blot out all our iniquities;" she bids us come day by day with "broken and contrite hearts," which GOD "will not despise;" to "rend our hearts" that "GOD may repent Him of the evil;" to seek of GOD "correction," though "with judgment, not in His anger;" to go daily to our Father, and say unto Him that we are "no more worthy to be called His sons." She teaches us daily to confess all the sins of our past life; all our past "erring and straying," our *having* "offended against His holy laws," *having* "left undone, what we ought to have done, and done what we ought not to have done;" three times a week she teaches us to pray to be delivered "from His wrath and from everlasting damnation," and "in the day of judgment;" that He would give us "true repentance, forgive us *all* our sins, negligences, and ignorances." And in her most solemn service, she would have us approach with "true penitent hearts;" still gathering before our eyes, all the sins of our past

¹ This prayer was objected to by the Puritans, and consistently with their system. Their objection shows the more how much of doctrine is contained in our ancient prayers, that they do breathe a *different moral spirit*.

lives, that "the remembrance of them" being "grievous unto us, and the burthen of them intolerable," we may bring them all before Him, pray Him, "for JESUS CHRIST's sake to forgive us *all* that is past."

In the solemn service, again, with which this season has just begun, she "admonishes us of the *great* indignation of God against sinners," that "we may the rather be moved to *earnest* and true repentance;" and then after most deep confession of sins, gives us not peace herself, but prays, in the words which He placed in the mouths of His priests to bless, "the Lord lift up the light of His countenance upon us and give us peace." She guides us from herself, either preaching or blessing, to Him who is "the merciful receiver of all true penitent sinners," and to His untold, unfathomable, mercies in CHRIST JESUS; she would have us continually lean on His mercy, not as confident that our sins were already blotted out, but rather as beholding ourselves "full of" all "the sores" which by our past sins, we had inflicted upon our souls, yet trusting that His mercy will yet be greater than our sins, striving to cleanse ourselves, yet awaiting to the end His gracious sentence, whereby He shall say "I will, be thou clean," and "deliver us from the extreme "malediction which shall light upon them that shall "be set on the left hand, and set us on His right "hand, and give us the gracious benediction of His "Father, commanding us to take possession of His "glorious kingdom." And so she continues even to *the end*; she exhorts us *all* twice every day, after her

Absolution, to beseech God to “grant us true repentance—a truer and deeper repentance than we have;—prays for it in the Litany, in connection with our *past* “sins, negligences, and ignorances;” prays again throughout Lent that (what a modern system looks upon as taking place once only in life) “God “would *create* and make in us *new* and contrite “ [broken] *hearts* ; that we *worthily* lamenting our “sins and acknowledging our wretchedness,” &c. and thus, to the verge of the grave, or whenever sickness brings death and judgment in nearer sight, she not only exhorts *all* “truly to repent,” but prays for them that “the sense of their weakness may add “strength to their faith, and *seriousness* to their repentance.” She would have both deepened in us to our last breath, that we may in penitent trust close our eyes, and approach the Judge of all—with the words of that great example of humble repentance and exceeding faith, “Lord remember me, when “Thou comest in Thy kingdom.” The very titles with which she accompanies the name of repentance show how deep and earnest her views of repentance are; she never names it without some word to express its reality. Thus she speaks again and again of “*true* repentance¹,” “and *seriousness* to repentance²,” “*unfeigned* repentance²,” “*earnest* and true repent-

¹ Twice in the Daily Absolution, in Visitation of the sick (where it occurs three times, being omitted in the prayers for persons troubled in mind or in conscience); Litany; Communion Service, twice.

² Visitation of sick.

“ance¹,” “with *all* contrition¹,” “*faithful* repentance¹,” and in her service of most solemn joy, the Communion of her Lord, she comes most broken-hearted; she has there her deepest confession of guilt, and there she most accumulates these titles. Its unspeakable blessings she sets forth, having first said “if with a *true* penitent heart—we receive that Holy Sacrament; for *then*,” &c. then she exhorts us, “repent *you truly* of your sins past—so shall ye be made *partakers*, &c.,” then placing that confession in our mouths, she invites us with the words, “Ye that do *truly* and *earnestly* repent you of your sins;” then pronounces her absolution upon us, as such as “with *heartly* repentance turn unto Him:” so that her address “Hear what comfortable words our Saviour Christ saith unto all that *truly* turn to Him: ‘Come unto Me, all ye that travail, and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you,’ sound indeed most comfortably. Her sense of the awful privileges of the Communion, and her own manifold unworthiness, and deep expressions of repentance³, harmonize truly together: modern systems would have had neither.

This appears to me then the characteristic difference of the three systems; Romanism as well as Ultra-Protestantism would consult readily for man’s

¹ Commination Service.

³ Much instruction on the repentant character of our Liturgy, will be found in a Tract now being published, No. 86. “On the Indications of a Superintending Providence in the preservation of the Liturgy, and the changes which it has undergone.”

feverish anxiety to be altogether at ease; our Church sets him in the way in which GOD's peace may descend upon him, but forestalls not His sentence. She has no second Baptism to give, and so she cannot pronounce him altogether free from his past sins. There are but two periods of *absolute* cleansing, Baptism and the day of judgment. She therefore teaches him continually to repent, that so his sins *may be* blotted out, though she has no commission to tell him absolutely that they *are*; she repeats to him his LORD's words, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy-laden, and *I* will give you rest," and so sends him to her LORD that he may "find rest for his soul," but does not anticipate His gracious act; she absolves him, "if he earnestly and heartily desire it," "by His authority committed unto" her, and then, (even while holding out her most solemn form of Absolution, as a means of relieving the troubled conscience,) she confesses the incompleteness of her own act, in that she subjoins a prayer for pardon of those sins, from which she had just absolved him; "O most merciful God, who dost so put away the
 "sins of those who truly repent, that Thou remem-
 "berest them no more; Open Thine eye of mercy
 "upon this Thy servant, who most earnestly desireth
 "pardon and forgiveness; impute not unto him his
 "former sins." The very renewal of her Eucharistic absolution "pardon and deliver you from *all* your sins," attests that she does not hold them to have been all absolutely remitted; but thus she sets him in a way

whereby he may obtain peace ; she bids him repent, sorrow, sue for pardon, not forget his repentance, come to Him who can and will give rest, pronounces over him His Absolution, invites him where “ his “ sinful body may be made clean by His Body, and “ His soul washed through His most precious Blood,” blesses him with His blessing, “ the Peace of God “ which passeth all understanding,” and so dismisses him, bearing with him, as she hopes, His peace, Who Alone is “ the Author of Peace,” Whose alone it is to bestow it. And this is altogether in accordance with Scripture, which uniformly speaks of “ peace” as the *direct* gift of GOD. “ Grace be unto “ you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord “ Jesus Christ,” is the standing¹ Apostolic salutation to the Church ; and thence is the Church’s blessing², “ The Peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds ;” so again³

¹ It is used by St. Paul, with a very slight variation in all his Epistles ; in Rom. i. 7 ; 1 Cor. i. 3 ; 2 Cor. i. 2 ; Eph. i. 2 ; Phil. i. 2 ; Col. i. 2 ; 1 Thess. i. 1 ; 2 Thess. i. 2 ; Phil. 3. ; “ Grace be unto you and peace from God *our* Father and the Lord Jesus Christ ;” in Gal. i. 3. it is “ from God *the* Father ;” in 1 Tim. i. 2. “ Grace, mercy and peace from God *our* Father,” &c. ; 2 Tim. i. 2. “ *the* Father ;” Tit. i. 3. “ the Lord Jesus Christ the Saviour ;” St. Peter uses a similar salutation, 2 Pet. i. 2. “ Grace and peace *be multiplied* unto you through the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord ;” and St. John, writing to an individual, (2 Epist. 3.) the same as that of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus, but adding “ the Son of the Father in truth and love.”

² Phil. iv. 7.

³ 2 Thess. iii. 16.

“the Lord of peace give you peace always;” “My¹ peace I give unto you;” “the God² of hope fill you with all peace and joy in believing;” “The fruit³ of the Spirit is love, joy, peace;” GOD is the “God of Peace,” our LORD “is our peace⁴;” nor is peace spoken of any where as coming from any other source but directly from Him.

The difference then between the views in question is not, as to the hope of pardon to the penitent, not even as to the prospect of peace in this world; but as to what is penitence, and how that peace is to be obtained; whether from men’s declarations, or directly from GOD; whether at first or at last, whenever it pleases GOD to send it; whether amid forgetfulness of past sin, or while recalling it in bitterness of recollection and praying GOD for His Son’s sake to pardon it; whether amid continual humiliation which saith “God be merciful to me a sinner,” or amid exultation at being free from self-righteousness. As repentance is GOD’s gift, and GOD’s work in a man’s soul, so is there obviously great danger in interfering with it; “He woundeth” and He must “heal;” He “killeth” and He must “make alive;” He “bringeth down to the grave and bringeth up.” They must have had but little acquaintance with wounded consciences, who know not how terribly He does “chasten man for sin, making his beauty to consume away,” how “He writeth bitter things

¹ John xiv. 27. ² Rom. xv. 13. ³ Gal. v. 22. ⁴ Eph. ii. 14.

against him, and maketh him to possess his former iniquities;" and in this awfulness of His chastisements, which we very often cannot mitigate, though we would, He bids us beware how we interfere with His work in the soul, or apply lenitives, when He is probing the diseased and ulcerous part "to the very dividing of the soul and body." These false kindnesses, (which in one body of Christians, now daily parting more from the Church, is become systematic,) are continually marring the work, which GOD had with a healthful severity begun. The penitent, untimely delivered from his distress, loses the energy of repentance, and the hatred of sin, which GOD was annealing into his soul, and becomes a common-place and a sickly Christian. What I would urge then, is to hold out the prospect of peace, but as GOD's gift through the deepening of repentance; not to cut short His work, whether by the Sacrament of penance, or inward persuasions, or misapplied promises of the Gospel; but to direct to His mercies in CHRIST; and He, who "knoweth whereof we are made, and remembereth that we are but dust," will have pity on them, "as a father pitieth his own children," when they have learnt to "fear Him." Not peace, but salvation is our end; but peace also He, the GOD of peace, will bestow, as He sees most healthful for them, according to the evenness and consistency of their course; clouding it, if they are remiss or halting; renewing it, when they humble themselves and press onward; and in all cases bestowing upon us more *than* we deserve, for His sake "Who is our Peace."

Art. XXV. *On the Sacraments.*

On the Sacraments, two sets of charges are brought; one, that we unduly exalt the Sacraments of our LORD; the other that we are not disinclined to ascribe a sacramental character to other rites which the Church of Rome has defined to be Sacraments in the same sense as Baptism and the Holy Eucharist. And these two charges have naturally gone together; for in the school of Calvin and Zuingli, the two great Sacraments have been so lowered, that they who have learned therein, would speak of them in language scarcely so high as we should of rites, which are not "Sacraments of the Gospel." We must then to them appear both to ascribe to these rites, the character of Sacraments, as they conceive of Sacraments, and to exalt the true Sacraments to something higher.

To speak first of that portion of that charge, which relates to Sacraments generally. The caution of our Church on this subject is very remarkable; she nowhere denies that there are more than two Sacraments, *in some sense of the word*; nay, in the Articles, Catechism, and Homilies alike, she implies or asserts that there are more; in the Articles she denies only that "those five commonly called Sacraments—are to be counted for *Sacraments of the Gospel*, being such as have grown partly of the "corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are *states of life allowed in the Scriptures*, but *yet have not the*

“*like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the*
 “*Lord’s Supper:*” for in that she says that they
 “*have not the like nature of Sacraments*” with the
 two great Sacraments, she rather implies that some
 of them have *some* sacramental character, though not
 “*like*” to those two. In like manner, when, in her Cate-
 chism she teaches her children, that there are “*two*
 “*Sacraments, only, ordained by Christ in His Church,*
 “*generally, [i. e. universally,] necessary to salvation,*”
 she implies that there are other rites which might
 have the name, though not of this high dignity, nor
 “*universally necessary*” nor “*ordained by Christ*
 “*Himself.*” And precisely this distinction is made in
 the Homilies, which recognize several “*sacraments*”
 in that larger sense, at the very time that, and in
 the same language as the Articles, they distinguish
 between them, and the two great Sacraments. “*As*¹
 “*for the number of them [the Sacraments] if they*
 “*should be considered according to the exact signifi-*
 “*cation of a Sacrament, namely for visible signs, ex-*
 “*pressly commanded in the New Testament, where-*
 “*unto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of*
 “*sins, and of our holiness and joining in Christ, there*
 “*be but two; namely Baptism and the Supper of*
 “*the Lord. For although Absolution hath the pro-*
 “*mise of forgiveness of sins, yet by the express word*
 “*of the New Testament, it hath not this promise*
 “*annexed and tied to the visible sign, which is imposi-*

¹ Of Common Prayer and Sacraments.

“ tion of hands. For this visible sign, (I mean lay-
 “ ing on of hands,) is not expressly commanded in
 “ the New Testament to be used in Absolution, as
 “ the visible signs in Baptism and the Lord’s Supper
 “ are; and therefore Absolution is *no such Sacrament*
 “ *as Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are*, and though
 “ the ordering of ministers hath this visible sign and
 “ promise, yet it lacks the promise of remission of
 “ sin, *as all other Sacraments besides the above named*
 “ *do*. Therefore neither it, *nor any other Sacrament*
 “ *else, be such Sacraments* as Baptism and the Com-
 “ munion are. But in a general acception, the name
 “ of a Sacrament may be attributed to any thing,
 “ whereby an holy thing is signified. In which un-
 “ derstanding of the word, the ancient writers have
 “ given this name not only to the other five, com-
 “ monly of late years taken and used for supplying
 “ the number of the seven Sacraments, but also to
 “ divers and sundry other ceremonies, as to oil,
 “ washing of feet, and such like; not meaning thereby
 “ to repute them as Sacraments, *in the same significa-*
 “ *tion* that the two fore-named Sacraments are. And
 “ therefore St. Augustine, weighing the true signifi-
 “ cation and *exact meaning* of the word, writing to
 “ Januarius, and also in the third book of Christian
 “ doctrine, affirmeth that the ‘ Sacraments of Christ-
 “ ians as they are most excellent in signification, so
 “ are they most few in number ;’ and in both places
 “ maketh mention expressly of two, the Sacrament
 “ of Baptism and the Supper of the LORD. And

“ although there are retained by the order of the
 “ Church of England, besides these two, certain
 “ other rites and ceremonies about the institution of
 “ ministers in the Church, Matrimony, Confirmation
 “ of children by examining them of their knowledge
 “ of the articles of faith, and joining thereto the
 “ prayers of the Church for them, and likewise for
 “ the Visitation of the sick; yet no man ought to
 “ take these for Sacraments, *in such signification and*
 “ *meaning*, as the Sacraments of Baptism and the
 “ Lord’s Supper are; but either for godly states of
 “ life, necessary in Christ’s Church, and therefore
 “ worthy to be set forth by public action and so-
 “ lemnity, by the ministry of the Church, or else
 “ judged to be such ordinances, as may make for the
 “ instruction, comfort, and edification of Christ’s
 “ Church.”

This passage is very remarkable for the principles which it contains, and the caution with which it is expressed; and that, the more, since the object of the writer, as well as of the Article, was to guard against an over-, rather than an under- value of these secondary Sacraments, or Sacramentals¹; he had then to protest against Romanist error, not against a profane indifference to sacred rites; and yet he not only

¹ The word “ Sacramentals” is used by Beza, (quoted Hooker, E. P. IV. i. 4. ed. Keble) to designate “ any ceremony importing signification of Spiritual things;” the introduction of any such into the Church of God, he declares to be a “ right grievous sin;” yet, remarkably enough, as Hooker observes, the title “ as sacraments”

altogether shrinks from denying that sacred rites may be termed "sacraments," but expressly calls them so, only laying down that they are "not *such* Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are," agreeing herein altogether with the Fathers. The modern school may apologize for, or elude the passage, but they clearly would not themselves have so written. (2) He does not even deny that some of those, which are not, in the highest sense, "sacraments," have a spiritual gift conveyed in connection with them. On the contrary, of Absolution he expressly says, that "it hath the promise of forgiveness of sins," only "not annexed to the visible sign," and is thereby distinguished from the great Sacraments. So, again, Orders he allows to have both "the visible sign and promise," *i. e.* of spiritual grace; but not "remission of sins," and thus it also is distinguished from the proper Sacraments. And this coincides with our Ordination Service; for the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost," had been a manifest impiety, unless the act of Ordination were, to those worthily receiving it, accompanied with the gift of the Holy Spirit; as indeed it is expressly affirmed by Holy Scripture, that an *inward* "gift" was bestowed upon Timothy through his ordination, "Stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands, with the lay-

which Hooker adopts (l. c.) is used by the same writers, who entitle "the Apostles' imposition of hands" "a sign, or as it were sacrament."

“ing on of the hands of the presbytery¹.” So further, he says in general of “other sacraments,” that they “*all* lack the promise of remission of sins;” implying at the same time, that there are others, which he would call sacraments (as Matrimony is expressly termed in another homily²), and that what at once distinguished them from the great Sacraments was, that they conveyed no “remission of sins;” whereby he virtually allows that they did convey spiritual grace. And so, probably, he meant that such rites, as did not “grow of the corrupt following of the Apostles” (Art. XXV.) had such spiritual grace; nor indeed does it appear how a sacred action, which is really a type or image of a sacred thing (which is his definition) should be destitute of spiritual influences. Such is also the teaching of later Divines of chief note in the Church. Thus Hooker vindicates against the Puritans, the spiritual graces of Confirmation, with an appeal to the universal teaching of the ancient Church. “The Fathers every where impute unto “it that gift or grace of the Holy Ghost, not which “maketh us Christian men, but, when we are made “such, assisteth us in all virtue, armeth us against “temptation and sin.”—“The Fathers therefore, being “thus persuaded, held confirmation as an ordinance “Apostolic, *always profitable* in God’s Church, al-

¹ 2 Tim. i. 6. 1 Tim. iv. 14.

² Sermon on Swearing, pt. i. See other authorities among later English Divines in Palmer on the Church, pt. 6. c. 8. t. 2. p. 442.

“ though not always accompanied with equal large-
 “ ness of those external effects, which gave it coun-
 “ tenance at the first.”—“ By which answer [of St.
 “ Jerome] it appeareth that his opinion was, that
 “ the Holy Ghost is received in Baptism : that con-
 “ firmation is only a *sacramental complement*.” “ Now
 “ what effect their imposition of hands hath, either
 “ after Baptism administered by heretics, or other-
 “ wise, St. Jerome in that place hath made no men-
 “ tion, because all men understood that in converts it
 “ tendeth to the fruits of repentance, and craveth
 “ in behalf of the penitent such grace as David after
 “ his fall desired at the hands of God ; in others, the
 “ fruit and benefit is that which hath been before
 “ shewn.’—“ Whereunto [to the fatherly encourage-
 “ ment and exhortation of the Bishops] imposition
 “ of hands and prayer being added, our warrant for
 “ the great good effect thereof is the same which Pa-
 “ triarchs, Prophets, Priests, Apostles, Fathers, and
 “ men of God, have had for such their particular in-
 “ vocations and benedictions, as no man, I suppose,
 “ professing truth of religion will easily think to have
 “ been without fruit¹.”

Not less remarkable, on the other side, is the
 light which this comparison throws upon the views
 of the writer of the Homily, as to the two great Sa-
 craments. He does not indeed rest the question of
 the number of proper sacraments, solely on the ex-

¹ Eccl. Pol. v. 66. § 4. 6. 7.

ternal distinctions, but goes also to the good ground of Christian Antiquity; and asserts them to be distinct, because the ancient Church ever so distinguished them. But besides this ground, he also, in the same way as the Articles and Catechism, alleges the peculiar dignity cast around the two proper Sacraments, in that in them nothing was left to be supplied by man; every thing in them was ordained by our LORD Himself; the visible sign, as well as the promise of the invisible grace, and the promised connexion between the two: so that although the one or other rite come near to have the character of a Sacrament, yet it falls short in that it is not equally guarded. Thus he points out that Absolution "hath the promise of forgiveness of sins," but not the connexion with the visible sign; Ordination hath *a* promise and the visible sign, but not *the* promise which the others have. And this distinctive promise is, union with our LORD, and consequent justification and sanctification; for so he expressly says, the "*exact*" definition of a sacrament is a visible sign, expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is "*annexed* the promise of *forgiveness* of our sins and of our *holiness* and *joining in Christ*." Other rites may be and are means of grace, but no other than the Sacraments of our LORD are means of direct union with Him. And this union, justification, sanctification, are according to this clear and distinct writer, not merely concomitants, accompanying the right use of the Sacrament, but they are (he uses the very

phrase to which the Ultra-Protestant theories from his day to our's most object) "*annexed and tied to the visible sign*;" for the absence of such annexation he alleges as the ground why Absolution is not to be regarded as a Sacrament; again coinciding with the language of the Catechism, that "they are the means, whereby we receive the inward and spiritual grace;" they are not only pledges to assure our faith; much less *mere* outward signs of what is worked inwardly, but means and channels whereby God conveys it.

Thus then this passage of the Homily conveys throughout precisely the view as to the distinction between the true, proper Sacraments, and those rites which in some respects approximate to Sacraments, and the grounds of that distinction, which are now stigmatized as Papistical. I need only adduce one passage, in which this distinction has of late been very clearly stated¹.

"If justification be the inward application of the Atonement, we are furnished at once with a sufficient definition of a sacrament for the use of our Church. The Romanist considers that there are seven; we do not strictly determine the number. We define the word generally to be an 'outward sign of an inward grace,' without saying to how many ordinances this applies. However, what we do determine is, that Christ has ordained two special Sacraments, as *generally necessary to salvation*.

¹ Newman on Justification, lect. 6. "on the gift of righteousness," v. fin. p. 169, 70.

“ This, then, is the characteristic mark of those two,
 “ separating them from all other whatever ; and what
 “ is this but saying in other words that they are the
 “ only *justifying* rites, or instruments of communi-
 “ cating the Atonement, which *is* the one thing
 “ necessary to us? Ordination, for instance, gives
 “ *power*, yet without making the soul acceptable to
 “ God; Confirmation gives light and strength, yet is
 “ the mere completion of Baptism; and Absolution
 “ is a negative ordinance removing the barrier which
 “ sin has raised between us and that grace, which by
 “ inheritance is our’s. But the two Sacraments ‘ of
 “ the Gospel,’ are the instruments of inward life,
 “ according to our Lord’s declaration, that Baptism
 “ is a new *birth*, and that in the Eucharist we eat the
 “ *living Bread*.”

Now this distinction, which, with the Homily,
 we have made, the Romanist will not make; for it
 would be conceding the whole question, were he to
 allow that two of his seven Sacraments were com-
 pletely *sui generis*, so as wholly to be above, and
 removed from, the other five. The rest would be a
 question of words and names only. On the con-
 trary, the Council of Trent, where it anathematizes
 any who should say, that, “ these ¹ seven Sacraments
 “ are in such wise equal among themselves, that one
 “ is in no respect superior to the other,” meant, as
 Card. Bellarmine ² explains it, to condemn those

¹ Sess. 7. can. 3.

² De Sacram. L. 2. c. 28.

who ascribe to Baptism the same dignity as the Eucharist; and he is very indignant with those impugners of the Council, who said that they observed this Canon, in that they did separate Baptism and the Eucharist from the rest, regarding the former as the institutions of CHRIST, the rest, as the inventions of men. "This," he says, "is to blink the question," for that first, the Council assumed that all seven are Sacraments of the New Law; secondly, that the object was to condemn a further error of the Lutherans, who regarded Baptism as of equal dignity with the Eucharist; thirdly, "the Council itself asserted the Eucharist to excel all the other Sacraments¹, but "did not make this comparison as to the others." Further, it is part of the Romanist system to inculcate that each of their Sacraments has not only something peculiar, but some superiority over the rest; that so there should result a sort of balance of dignity between them, and none, except the Eucharist, should be placed above the rest, so as to introduce any essential or practical disparity between them. And thus they guard their number seven; since though they cannot but admit that Baptism has some especial prerogatives over other of their Sacraments, so they contend, have others; so that this is to be no sufficient ground for distinguishing them. Thus Card. Bellarmine alleges, that "Baptism² excels "as to the effect of remitting sin, in that it remits

¹ Sess. 12. cap. 3.

² L. c.

“ original sin, and actual sins with all the punishment
 “ due to them, which other Sacraments do not;
 “ Confirmation excels as to the effect of grace toward
 “ good-doing, for it presupposes the effect of Baptism,
 “ and superadds more abundant grace; the Eucha-
 “ rist excels all, as to the substance of the Sacra-
 “ ment—as having not only an operative power, but
 “ containing truly Christ Himself the Author of that
 “ power; Penance excels all in necessity, except
 “ Baptism, with which it has this excellence in com-
 “ mon; Extreme Unction in a manner excels Pe-
 “ nance, as to the effect of grace, like as Confirmation
 “ excels Baptism, for it presupposes the whole effect
 “ of Penance, and adds more abundant grace, which
 “ can not only wipe away all sins, if present, but
 “ remove the very traces of sin; Orders excels all,
 “ except Confirmation, as to the minister, in that it
 “ can be conferred by a Bishop only; nay, herein it
 “ seems to excel Confirmation; since Confirmation,
 “ sometimes, by dispensation, may be conferred by a
 “ mere priest—also it excels the rest, in that it places
 “ man in a higher grade than other Christians;
 “ lastly, Matrimony excels in signification; for it
 “ signifies the union of Christ with the Church,
 “ whence it is called by the Apostle a ‘great Sacra-
 “ ment.’ ” No one can fail to see the object of these
 ingenious and fine-drawn distinctions, (which were
 held generally in the Council of Trent itself¹), nor

¹ “ All agree that if you regard the necessity and utility of the
 “ Sacraments, Baptism ought to have the preference; but Mar-

how presumptuously and wantonly Rome sacrifices the intrinsic greatness of one at least of the two great sacraments; nor the total difference of character between her distinctions, and those of the Homily and ourselves.

So then, this distinction between the "proper Sacraments" and "offices of the Church, to which there is allied a Sacramental efficacy," so far from being one connected with Romanism, was of old adopted in our Church against Romanism; and when Romanists would distinguish between the efficacy of *their* Sacraments, they do it altogether in a different way; for a different end; and assuming that they are all in one respect equal, as being all "*proper Sacraments.*"

Baptism.

A late Lutheran writer¹ admits that "as to the Sacrament of Baptism there is no controversy of much moment between the two Churches" [Lutheran and Romish]. It is then hardly worth while to enter into the question, what the Romish Church means by the "Character" impressed upon the baptized, and whether this may have a sound sense or no. There remains of course, one great difference between the two Churches, not peculiar to Baptism, but affect-

riage, if you regard what it signifies; Confirmation, if you look to the dignity of the minister; and the Eucharist, if to the veneration due to it." P. Sarpi, l. ii. c. 85.

¹ Marheineke Institt. Symbol. § 36.

ing much men's comfort and security, in receiving either Sacrament, that the "intention of the Priest to "do what the Church does," is, according to Rome, requisite to make the Sacrament valid. A well-known instance in the late history of France of one who confessed on his death-bed, that he for years administered the Sacraments, meaning expressly "*not* to do what "the Church did," illustrates at once the danger of such definitions, and the insecurity which this tenet, secured as it is by an anathema, must cast over those of the Romish Communion, whether they have indeed the Sacraments or no. "If any one say," are the words of Catharin, Bp. of Minori, in the Council of Trent¹, "that these cases [of meaning to make the

¹ Sarpi, Hist. de Concil. de Trente, l. ii. c. 86. He was arguing that "the intention of the minister" required by the Council of Florence for the validity of a Sacrament, should be restrained to the "outward intention, whatever the inward purpose of the officiator might be;" in other words, that all which should be necessary to the validity of a Sacrament on the part of the Priest, should be an outward conformity with the rites of the Church. He urged, "supposing an internal intention necessary, then, if a Priest having the care of four or five thousand souls should be an unbeliever yet a great hypocrite, who, whether in the Baptism of Infants, or the absolution of penitents, or the consecration of the Eucharist, had the intention of not doing what the Church does, then it must be said that all the children were damned, the penitents unabsolved, and that none of the communicants had derived any benefit." "He insisted much," continues the historian, "on the affliction which an affectionate father would feel, if, seeing his child dying, he doubted the intention of the Priest who had baptized it; or, the disquiet of one who

“ administration of the Sacraments a jest] are rare,
 “ would to God that in this corrupt age there were
 “ not reason to think that they are very frequent!”

The very belief that there was a power to invalidate the Sacraments would be used by Satan as a temptation to make men essay to do so. Ultra-Protestants, strangely enough, come round to the same result of casting uncertainty on the efficacy of Baptism, in that they make it, in infants, to depend upon the faith of the parents, sponsors, congregation, or *Ministers*, not on “ CHRIST’S institution and promises, although they “ be ministered by evil men.” Art. XXVI. And whereas they would call it “ popish” to believe that an infant is, through the faith of the Church, which

“ received Baptism in an imperfect frame of mind, should he have
 “ reason to suspect that the Priest who had baptized him, was a
 “ false Christian, and that instead of intending to baptize or to con-
 “ fess him, or to give him the Eucharist, he had meant only to
 “ wash him in jest, and to make a sport of all the rest,” on which
 follow the terrible words quoted in the text. The decree of the
 Council finally was, “ if any one say that in ministers, when they
 “ make and confer the Sacraments, there is not required at least
 “ the intention of doing what the Church does, let him be ana-
 “ thema.” Courayer says, that the mode in which Catharin ex-
 plained the Council of Florence, was insensibly adopted in the
 schools as the explanation of that of Trent, though opposed in the
 Council itself, and though the Council seemed to require an in-
 ternal intention on the part of the Minister. As far as it is
 adopted, it is a manifest evasion of the decree, “ on account,” as
 Courayer says, “ of the inconvenience resulting from its obvious
 “ sense.”

brings it unto CHRIST, accepted by Him, and regenerated by His Spirit, whatever be the character of the immediate human agents, they themselves coincide with the Romish error just stated¹. The principle of St. Augustine, on the contrary, that children being able to put no bar of an opposite will, God's goodness flows unrestrained towards them, is, in our own Church, thus beautifully expressed by Hooker²; "He which with imposition of hands and prayer did
 " so great works of mercy for restoration of bodily
 " health, was worthily judged as able to effect the
 " infusion of heavenly grace into them whose age
 " was not yet depraved with that malice which might

¹ "Why leave two or three expressions in the Baptismal Service and her Catechism, so unguarded by explanation, as to induce many to imagine that every child is really regenerated in that ordinance, and made a true and living member of Christ, by a certain form of words, however, and *by whomsoever* (being a priest) pronounced, and even in spite of the unbelief or carelessness of all the parties concerned."—Essays on the Church, p. 269. Another ushers in, with an apology, a hypothetic case of a foxhunting clergyman, in illustration of the same point, (Fraser, p. 18). So with regard to the other Sacrament. it is used as part of an argument *ex absurdo*; "in infidel and debased Spain and Italy, our Lord's Body and Blood is constantly offered to the people, inasmuch as the priests who there officiate—*unbelievers as most of them* are—are yet the right line of Apostolic succession!"—Essays, p. 312. Yet what has the unbelief of the Priest to do with the privileges of the people? "does their unbelief make void the righteousness of God?"

² Eccl. Pol. v. 66. 1. ed. Keble.

“be supposed a bar to the goodness of God towards them. They brought Him therefore young children to put his hands upon them and pray.”

In the same way again Archbishop Bramhall¹: “Secondly, we distinguish between the visible sign, and the invisible grace; between the external sacramental ablution, and the grace of the Sacrament, that is, interior regeneration. We believe that whosoever hath the former, hath the latter also, *so that he do not put a bar against the efficacy of the Sacrament by his infidelity or hypocrisy, of which a child is not capable*, and therefore our very Liturgy doth teach, that a child baptized, dying before the commission of actual sin, is undoubtedly saved.” And more recently, Waterland²: “The second is the case of infants. Their innocence and incapacity are to them instead of repentance, which they do not need, and of actual faith, which they cannot have. They are capable of being savingly born of water and the Spirit, and of being adopted into sonship with what depends thereupon; *because though they bring no virtues with them, no positive righteousness, yet they bring no obstacle, no impediment.*”

The modern school, which denies as “Popish” this

¹ Of persons dying without Baptism, Works, p. 979, quoted in Tracts, No. 76. Catena Patrum, No. 2. “Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration,” p. 20.

² On Regeneration, 2, quoted ib. p. 46.

doctrine (and it is upon it that the question of the baptismal regeneration of all infants in fact turns), have apparently yet to learn that Christian Baptism is not that of the servant but of the LORD; that in the language of the Ancient Church "it is not man, " but Christ, who baptizeth."

The chief charge against Rome as to the Sacrament of Baptism is, not that she has unduly exalted it, but, on the very contrary, that she has depreciated it. She insists indeed on its necessity, and there leaves it. This is the very coldest way, in which it could have been spoken of; she enlarges not on the gifts bestowed through it, on the Presence of our LORD thereat; on His communicating Himself to the soul, or His applying His own most precious Blood, thereby; or on the sacred Presence of the Holy Ghost the Comforter, and His thenceforth making the baptized His temple unless He be grieved away. These blessed truths she rather cast into the shade, though she would not deny them: in her anxiety to secure a *peculiar* Presence of our LORD in the Holy Eucharist, she rather conceals, and is unwilling to dwell on, His Sacred Presence in this Sacrament, whereby He makes us members of Himself: in her wish to vindicate the equality and dignity of her other Sacraments, as Sacraments, she is obliged to disguise that which constitutes the peculiar greatness of the two proper Sacraments,—the union with and Presence of our LORD,—and vindicates it to one only in a carnal way. The dignity also

which she ascribes to her Sacraments of Confirmation and Penance, leads her members the more away from looking to their Baptism; for Confirmation presupposes, as Bellarmine says, the gifts of Baptism and adds more abundant grace, and so, “ excels it as to “ the effect of grace for good-doing ;” and when one sins among them, he is to look, not to GOD’s mercies in Christ pledged to him in Baptism, and all the undefined and overflowing favour and loving-kindness involved in being made a member of the ever-Blessed Son, but to a distinct Sacrament of Penance. Thus, in both ways, her members are taught to look upon Baptism as a mere preliminary act, in the back-ground as it, were of the Christian life; the foreground, upon which their eye is fixed, being taken up by their Sacrament of Penance and the Holy Eucharist. It is, indeed, a remarkable instance of the effect of her whole system, even upon parts where she has not introduced error: it illustrates also mournfully the cancerous nature of error in any portion of revealed truth, how it spreads and preys upon the parts yet sound. As to Holy Baptism, Rome innovated not, and yet she has doubly lowered it; by a carnal glory, which she would shed around the Holy Eucharist, and by the obstinacy, wherewith she would maintain the number of her seven Sacraments, and the human theories she had to resort to in order to uphold them. This indeed was the charge, brought by our early Controversialists against Rome,—that she depreciated the Sacrament of Baptism, to make way for her theory

respecting that of the Holy Eucharist; and so *they* would remedy her error on the latter, not in the modern way, by lowering both Sacraments, but by showing that Baptism had the same glorious privileges belonging to it, on which Rome would build up its carnal explanation of our LORD's presence in the Holy Eucharist. Thus Bp. Jewell ¹, "*Are we not partakers of the same Divine Substance in the Sacrament of Baptism?*" St. Augustine saith, 'By Baptism we are incorporate into Christ, and are made one Body with His Body.' Leo saith, 'The Body of him that is new born in Baptism, is made the flesh of Christ crucified,' that is to say, 'Flesh of His Flesh, and Bone of His Bone?' Yet nevertheless, "the very substance of water remaineth still. Even so, notwithstanding we be made partakers of the Divine Substance of Christ, in the receiving of the holy Mysteries, yet the substance of bread therein remaineth still. And forasmuch as ye would prove by these words of St. Ambrose, that Christ is present in the Sacraments, the same St. Ambrose also saith, that Christ is *likewise present in the water of Baptism*. Thus he saith, &c." And in another place he explicitly brings this charge against the Romanists, "Forasmuch ² as these two Sacraments being both of force alike, these men [the

¹ Defence of Apologie, p. 22. See also Replie to Harding, 285. and further references in "Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism," p. 179. sqq. ed. 1.

² Reply, p. 249, 50. quoted more at length. Ibid.

“ Romanists] to advance their fantasies in the one,
 “ by comparison so much abase the other, I think
 “ it good, briefly and by the way, somewhat to touch
 “ what the old Catholic Fathers have written of
 “ God’s invisible workings in the Sacrament of Bap-
 “ tism. The Fathers in the Council of Nice say
 “ thus :” &c.

So then this school, while they think they have been opposing Romanist tendencies, have abandoned the strongest argument against them, and the most likely to recover them from their errors as to the Holy Eucharist.

But although in reality Rome has not, as to this Sacrament, admitted any positive statement, (at least none of any greater moment,) un-Catholic and un-Primitive, great and main points there are in the doctrine of Baptism, which by those who have followed an “ extreme reformation,” have ever been accounted part of the corruptions of Popery. It was one of the objections of the Non-Conformists to our Liturgy, at the Savoy-Conference, and held to be “ sinful,” that the Minister was “ obliged to pronounce all baptized “ infants unregenerate ;” and modern Dissenters continue the charge ¹. Those however, in our Church, who in this and other doctrinal points, have followed the teaching of the Non-Conformists, (since they cannot, as Ministers of the Church, blame the Liturgy,) throw the blame upon those who understand it as the

¹ See Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism, p. 176. ed. 1.

Non-Conformists out of the Church, and the Bishops within it, at that time equally did. It is, indeed, not one of the least strange phenomena of the day, that a truth should be by newspapers and periodicals branded in members of the Church as a modern "heresy," which eighty years past, it is acknowledged, was held by almost every minister of the Church¹, which is still held probably, at all events by all her Bishops; nay, that it should have been (until of late when the field has been widened) denominated as "*the Oxford* "heresy," and placed as the head and front of our offending.

I own, my Lord, I have myself shrunk from stating fully the degree of evidence which there is, that Baptismal regeneration is the doctrine of the Church of England, lest in these days when men hold so laxly by their Church, and are ready to quit her upon any ground of difference,—ready to suspect her, and very slow to suspect themselves,—the result of proving that Baptismal regeneration is the doctrine of our Church, would be that men would rather forsake their Church than embrace her doctrine. It seems to be looked upon as a first principle, that the duty of a Minister is to preach what he thinks the Gospel any how; and so if one discovers that he cannot consistently preach in the Church, he forthwith increases some old schism, or forms a new one, instead

¹ "Romaine states, that among the whole of the clergy, about 10,000 in number, of his time, there were not seven that preached the Gospel of Christ."—*Travels in Town*, t. ii. p. 105.

of remaining still, until he should see his way more clearly. Our schisms already threaten to make us a bye-word and a reproach, throughout the whole world; we carry our disgrace with us wherever we go; and are in danger of becoming a plague-spot to the Christian name, instead of being (as we might have been) one of the largest Communion, and the most flourishing of all collective Churches. The English nation is in the way to become the very type of schism. Rent as we are, I would not willingly contribute to make the rent worse. Those who wish to pursue the subject calmly, might be amply satisfied by the very clear and full statement in the valuable work of Bp. Bethell¹; for myself, I had rather continue to be termed "heretic" by those who know me not, than give occasion to any to become a "schismatic." It was the fault of the Church, in the last century, or rather of those who had the mastery over the Church, that her Ministers, by preaching her doctrines negatively or coldly, gave occasion to many whose spirit God had stirred, to seek instruction rather in the writings of those not of her Communion—the old Non-Conformists—than within herself. They were reproached in their day, as their successors now in turn reproach those who would build up the ancient doctrine. Their forefathers' was the happier lot. As however it has been sown, so must we reap; the true leaven will, we hope, in time

¹ General View of the Doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, c. 6. ed. 2.

leaven the whole lump, not by expelling any particles of it, but by converting them into itself; Moses' rod will swallow up the rest; meanwhile, while it is our duty to teach our own people the sound doctrine, one would rather endeavour to gain access in some other way to those whom we are not obliged to instruct, and not, upon a topic on which they are least inclined to be patient, urge upon them the words of a mother, whom they reverence not enough to obey against their own views, and whom possibly they might forsake. Others may do it, who could do it with less invidiousness. Not as if I entertained any doubt, my Lord, that we speak with our Church in this point, and that every syllable of her teaching in her services for Baptism, Confirmation, and the Catechism goes the same way; and that her Articles imply the same; (many who held otherwise, have seen this, when they came to study their Church's services dispassionately;) but that it seems useless and ungracious for us to press upon them, that their Church holds the doctrine, until their prejudices against it shall first be, as those of many are being, somewhat softened. And then the teaching of their Church will be plain to them. We would wish to gain, not to exasperate them. And in turn we might perhaps claim so much courtesy that the name of "heretic" or "heresy" should not be so freely used of doctrines, which, themselves confess, certain expressions¹ in the services of the Church

¹ See above, p. 112. "This one ordinance, Baptism, is made with many the point on which every thing turns. This probably

seem at first sight to favour. It seems hard measure to bestow on us the title "heretic" for taking literally those words of our Church, which they defend by supposing them to be spoken "in the judgment of charity," thereby allowing that our's is the plain and grammatical meaning, only that on other grounds it is to be taken with some allowance. And this courtesy we would claim rather for their own sakes than for our's.

And to this reconciliation it may perhaps the rather tend, if I add that we do not wish to enforce any technical view of Baptismal regeneration : for myself, I should be fully content with any view, which acknowledged in its simple sense the words which our Church teaches every child to say of itself, "wherein "I was made a child of God, a member of Christ, and "an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven;" (meaning of course, really what is there said, a real child of GOD, and a real member of CHRIST, not *simply* an "outward member of an outward body of people "called Christians.") The same truth may be variously viewed ; contemplated on different sides ; nay, it must be, according to our moral character, differently appreciated ; and so it may be that persons holding different language may in fact be expressing different parts of the same truth, and speaking of it in different relations, but still hold it. The Western arises from a feeling that their main strength lies in this direction. We admit that the Church is more open to misconstruction on this point than on most others."—Fraser, p. 16.

Church after St. Augustine, *chiefly* spoke of the blessings of Baptism as the remission of sins; the Eastern as the introduction of a new principle of life; but both as flowing from our engrafting into CHRIST. To us, engrafting into, or being made a member of CHRIST, appears the fullest, as it is the most exalted expression of that doctrine, and yet in harmony also with what we see of the corruption of the actual Christian world, in that, though all have been made branches of the true Vine once, they only, which bear fruit, abide in CHRIST; the rest are "cast forth as a branch and withered." Yet though we would be thankful to be made the instruments of raising men's sense of the privileges of their Baptism, and cannot but see that, when it was held in its fulness, it cast a reality over other doctrine, and was a high spring to Christian action, we wish not to restrain the liberty of others. There is unquestionably in Christian Antiquity a tone about this and other connected truths, with which our present language and feelings and habits stand in melancholy contrast; but the whole must rise together; a higher doctrine of the Sacraments will increase men's sense of their Christian responsibilities; and more elevated Christian action (and by GOD's mercy Christian action is rising, we trust, towards a higher standard amongst us), will fit men to receive higher notions of the Sacraments, and enable them to hold them safely. But to this there are many approximations; and those, who are sensible of their own infirmities, will hail every approximation with joy, not measur-

ing rigidly how far it seems from their ideal, but rejoicing that, with themselves, it is approaching to it.

As tending to this end of peace, which your Lordship would so gladly promote, I may be permitted to adduce a statement by another hand, in which the writer assigns the bounds, within which Baptismal regeneration has been held by the chief Divines of our later Church, and separates off other questions in themselves important, yet still not essentially affecting the main question. In these detached questions many will find that their difficulties lie; and although a man's views of Baptismal regeneration will be affected by the way in which he settles these questions, yet are different views on them consistent with holding the main doctrine, and some may perhaps thereby be enabled to employ the Liturgy of their Church more literally than they at present do. It will happen also not unseldom on these points also, that people using nearly the same language, employ it in a lower or higher sense; as, one by admission into the Christian covenant will understand only an outward, another a mystical, though undefined, change of condition.

The writer then thus explains wherein he conceives the great body of our Divines to be agreed as to this doctrine, and what may be termed open questions among them.

“By¹ this doctrine is meant, first, that the Sa-

¹ Preface to *Catena Patrum*, No. 2. (*Tracts*, No. 76). “Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration.”

“ sacrament of Baptism is not a mere *sign* or *promise*,
 “ but actually a *means* of grace, an *instrument*, by
 “ which, when rightly received, the soul is admitted
 “ to the benefits of CHRIST’S atonement, such as the
 “ forgiveness of sin, original and actual, reconcilia-
 “ tion to God, a new nature, adoption, citizenship in
 “ Christ’s kingdom, and the inheritance of heaven,—
 “ in a word, Regeneration. And next, Baptism is
 “ considered to be rightly received, when there is no
 “ positive obstacle or hindrance to the reception in
 “ the recipient, such as impenitence or unbelief
 “ would be in the case of an adult; so that infants
 “ are necessarily right recipients of it, as not being
 “ yet capable of actual sin¹.

“ There is a variety of questions connected with
 “ the subject beyond the two positions above set
 “ down, on which the writers under review differ
 “ more or less from each other, but not so as in the
 “ slightest degree to interfere with their clear and
 “ deliberate maintenance of these. Such, for in-
 “ stance, as the following :—Whether grace be given
 “ in and through the water, or only contempora-
 “ neously with it. Again, whether Baptism, strictly
 “ speaking, *conveys* the blessings annexed to it, or
 “ simply *admits* into a state gifted with those bless-
 “ ings, as being the initiatory rite of the covenant of
 “ mercy. Or, again, whether or not Baptism, be-
 “ sides washing away past sin, admits into a state in
 “ which, for sins henceforth committed, Repentance
 “ stands in place of a Sacrament, so as to ensure

² See above, p. 112, 113.

“ forgiveness without specific ordinance ; or whether
 “ the Holy Eucharist is that ordinance ; or whether
 “ the full and explicit absolution of sin after Baptism
 “ is altogether put off till the day of judgment. Or,
 “ again, there may be difference of opinion as to
 “ the state of infants dying unbaptized. Or, again,
 “ whether Regeneration is an instantaneous work
 “ completed in Baptism, or admits of degrees and
 “ growth. Or, again, whether or not the Holy Spirit
 “ can utterly desert a soul once inhabited by Him,
 “ except to quit it for ever. Or, whether the change
 “ in the soul made by Baptism is indelible, for good
 “ or for evil ; or may be undone, as if it had never
 “ been. Or, how far the enjoyment of the grace
 “ attached to it is suspended on the condition of our
 “ doing our part in the Covenant. All these are
 “ questions, far from unimportant, but which do not
 “ at present come into consideration ; the one point,
 “ maintained in the following extracts, being, that
 “ infants are by and at Baptism unconditionally
 “ translated from a state of wrath into a state of
 “ grace and acceptance for Christ’s sake.”

Art. XXVIII. *Of the Lord’s Supper.*

On the other great Sacrament the distinction between the doctrine of our Church, and that of Rome on the one hand and Ultra-Protestantism on the other, is in reality so broad and distinct, that there is the less difficulty. Nor is it, like Baptismal rege-

neration, the point of divergence of two systems; and so it may be considered with less view to its consequences as to other portions of truth. And one result of this has been, that many who, from being entangled in a modern system, have parted more or less from our Church's teaching upon Baptism, hold much higher and truer views of this Sacrament. Then also, as recurring in their actual Christian life, they could the less look upon it in an abstract way, or as a theory; their devotion and love for their Redeemer has sustained their doctrinal views; and the teaching of their Church, has found a more ready entrance, when received apart from controversy, amid the most solemn part of the devotions of the Christian man. This teaching which we receive in its plain sense, contains, we are persuaded, the full Catholic truth; we wish neither to add to it, nor to take from it. I would state it in connection with, or in the words of our Formularies. It is, that the "Body and Blood of Christ are *verily* and indeed "taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's "Supper¹;" that they are conveyed by means of the elements, in that the article² says, that "the Body of "Christ is *given*, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, "only after an heavenly and spiritual manner;" for the word "given," as opposed to "taken and received," implies, as has been remarked³, that It accompa-

¹ Church Catechism.

² Art. XXVIII.

³ Knox on the use and import of the Eucharistic Symbols. Remains, T. i. p. 170.

nies in some mysterious way, the distribution of the elements, in that It is "given" by the Priest, and "taken and received" by the Communicants; and another article¹ says that the Sacraments" are *effectual* "signs of grace, *by* the which He doth work invisibly "in us." Further, we really, though "spiritually eat "the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood²;" and, as the fruit of this, "we dwell in Christ and Christ in "us; we are one with Christ and Christ with us;" and of this real indwelling the further fruit, as the Homily³ said, is our justification and sanctification, "that our sinful⁴ bodies are made clean by His Body, "and our Souls washed through His most precious "Blood;" and a continued fitness for Him to dwell therein, "that we may evermore dwell in Him, and "He in us:" further, we do not simply "feed on," as if it were an act of *our* faith *only*, but we are by God *fed* "with⁵ the Spiritual food of the most precious

¹ Only one out of *nine* "Reformed" Confessions, *i. e.* such as express the Zuingli-Calvinist doctrines as to the Sacraments, has the word "efficacia," *effectual*, and that one in a different sense; and *two* only use the word "through," or "by," and they explain it away. See Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism, Note L, p. 238. ed. 1.

² Exhortation at the Communion.

³ The homily defined this to be the characteristic of the true Sacraments. See above, p. 98. sqq.

⁴ Prayer just before the Consecration.

⁵ "We most heartily thank thee for that *Thou* dost vouchsafe to *feed* us, who have duly received these holy Mysteries, with," &c. —Thanksgiving after the Communion.

“ Body and Blood of His dear Son,” yea “ He ¹ hath
 “ given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ to be our
 “ Spiritual food and sustenance *in* that holy Sacra-
 “ ment;” and if we join hereto the lesson which one
 of the writers of the homilies, bids us “ take ² of Emis-
 “ senus a godly father, when we go up to the reve-
 “ rend communion, to be satisfied with Spiritual
 “ meats, we look up with faith upon the holy Body and
 “ Blood of our God; we marvel with reverence; *we*
 “ *touch it with our mind*; we receive it with the hand
 “ of our heart; we take it fully with our inward man.”

On this combined teaching of our Articles, Catechism and Liturgy, we believe the doctrine of our Church to be, that in the Communion, there is a true, real ³, actual, though Spiritual, (or rather the more real, because Spiritual) Communication of the Body and Blood of Christ to the believer through the Holy Elements; that there is a true, real, spiritual, Presence of Christ at the Holy Supper; more real than if we could, with Thomas, feel Him with our hands, or thrust our hands into His side; that this is bestowed upon faith, and received by faith, as is every other Spiritual gift, but that our faith is but a receiver of God's real, mysterious, precious, Gift; that faith opens our eyes to see what is really there, and our hearts to receive it; but that It is there independently of our faith.

¹ Exhortation.

² First part of homily of the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, end.

³ “ Verily and indeed.”—Church Catechism.

And this real, spiritual Presence it is, which makes it so awful a thing to approach unworthily. It is the Presence of the Holy Ghost within us, imparted by Baptism, and hallowing our bodies as His temple, which makes the profanation of the bodies of the baptized so terrible a sin ; it is “the dignity of that “ holy *Mystery*” which causes “the great peril of “ the unworthy receiving thereof;” its being “ a “ Divine thing to those who receive It worthily,” which makes It “ so dangerous to them that will presume to receive It unworthily.” On no theory, whereby the sacred elements should be *mere* representations, or signs, or pledges, or tokens, of an absent thing, or means to kindle our faith, would the unworthy reception of the Holy Eucharist be so much more dreadful, than profane conduct in Church, where also CHRIST is “ in the midst of” us. All which Scripture says of this case, “ not discerning the Lord’s “ Body,” “ guilty of the Body and Blood of the “ Lord,” implies an immediate, unseen, Presence of that Body, which the wicked discern not, cannot partake of, but offend against, and so “ eat and drink “ judgment to themselves” in “ that they eat and drink “ the Sacrament of so great a thing.”

We do not then yield to the Romanists, as to the greatness of our privileges ; we do not think that our LORD is less really and spiritually present than they ; that He communicates Himself less by His Sacraments than they ; that we less receive His Body and Blood, that our sinful bodies are less cleansed by His

glorious Body : that it is less “ the ¹ salve of immortality and sovereign preservative against death ; a “ deific communion ; the sweet dainties of our Saviour ; the pledge of eternal health ; the defence “ of faith ; the hope of the Resurrection ; the food of “ immortality ; the healthful grace ; the conservatory “ to everlasting life ; ” we do not believe “ This is My “ Body ” less than they ; we blame them, not as exceeding as to the greatness of the spiritual gift contained in that Sacrament (all human language and thoughts must fall short), but for their carnal conceptions of it ; for attempting to explain to man’s senses the *mode* of his SAVIOUR’S Presence ; for trying to solve the apparent contradiction that the elements are still what they were, but are, over and above, *to us* the Body and Blood of our LORD ; for longing, with the weak faith of Nicodemus, to know the *how* of things Divine and Spiritual, and so for debasing them, and by their explanations leading, at least their Priesthood, to pride, and then to unbelief.

We would not then, my Lord, insist upon words,

¹ Sayings of the Fathers, quoted in the 1st part of the “ homily of the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the “ Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ,” as “ sayings of “ godly men,” “ the ancient Catholic Fathers,” “ truly attributed “ to this celestial banquet and feast,” of which it says, together with some of Holy Scripture, “ if we would often call to mind, “ O how would they influence our hearts to desire the participation of these mysteries, and oftentimes to covet after this “ bread, continually to thirst for this food.”

if others will acknowledge the realities ; we are content ourselves to receive the words “ The Body of our “ Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee,” &c. as they were used in the ancient Church from which our own preserved and restored them, not as denoting something absent, but as implying the spiritual unseen Presence of that Blessed Body and Blood, conveyed to us through the unchanged though consecrated elements, unchanged in material substance, changed in their use, their efficacy, their dignity, mystically and spiritually. We see not why we need avoid language used by the Fathers, as well as by the ancient Liturgies, and quoted with approbation by great Divines of our Church, that “ the bread and “ wine is made the Body and Blood of Christ¹,” seeing that its being spiritually the Body and Blood of CHRIST, interferes not with its being still corporeally what the Apostle calls it, “ the bread and wine,” nor with the nature of a Sacrament, but rather the better

¹ “ To whom Christ hath imparted power both over that mystical body which is the society of souls, and over that natural “ which is Himself, for the knitting of both in one ; a work, “ which Antiquity doth call the making of Christ’s Body.”—Hooker, E. P. V. lxxvii. 2. ed. Keble. “ We are not ignorant “ that the ancient Fathers generally teach, that the bread and “ wine in the Eucharist by and upon the consecration of them do “ become, and *are made the Body* and Blood of Christ. But we “ know also, that though they do not all explain themselves the “ same way, yet they do all declare their sense to be very dissonant “ from the doctrine of transubstantiation.” Bp. Ball, Corruptions of the Church of Rome, iii. 2. Works, t. ii. p. 255. ed. Burton.

agrees thereto. We would not insist on these words; only we fear that when men object to them they object not to the words but to the realities, not to the terms, but to the truth they convey.

For deeply as Rome has erred, and much error as she has thereby given occasion to in others, we fear that others have erred still more deeply. Not Zuingli alone, but Calvin, have, in their way, so explained the mode of Christ's presence, as virtually to explain it away. With the fear of a weak faith, that would fain guard in a way of their own against man's giving God's glory to the outward elements, they transferred the presence of Christ *simply* to the believer's soul, and thus, on their side, destroyed "the nature of a Sacrament," depriving it of its inward fulness, as the Romanists, by the doctrine of Transubstantiation, had removed the outward sign. Their theory can hardly be better characterized than by words used by one of a very different school from ourselves, that "the faith of the believer" is not only (which all acknowledge, and as our Article states,) "the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper," but, is "the true consecrating principle—that which brings down Christ to the heart of each individual." The Zuingli-Calvinist theory, however it might disguise itself, (often from itself) in words, came to this; that the outward elements were not channels or instruments of grace, but that their only office was to kindle the faith of the individual, to set Christ

before his eyes, that so he might in mind ascend into heaven, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God, feed on Him there by faith, appropriate His merits, and thereby become united with Him. And these things they often speak of eloquently, but the Sacraments themselves had no more share in even this elevation of the Christian's soul, than the hearing of God's word, upon which, according to them, their efficacy depended.

We would maintain then, my Lord, that here also our Church holds the Catholic truth distinct from the modern novelties, whether of Rome, or Zurich, or Geneva; that she holds a real, spiritual, presence of our LORD in the Holy Eucharist, that He really and truly therein and thereby imparts Himself, His Body, and His Blood, to the believer; and that through this gift bestowed by Him, and received through faith, Christ dwelleth in us and we in Him: we maintain, on the other side, that Rome has grievously erred by explaining in a carnal way the mode of this Presence, and requiring this her carnal exposition to be received as an article of Faith. She anathematizes¹ us, in our Church, for holding that "in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there remains the substance of bread and wine," and "denying that wonderful and remarkable conversion of the whole substance of bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of wine into the Blood, so that there re-

¹ Sess. 12, can. 2.

“main only the appearances of bread and wine,” “which,” it proceeds, “the [Roman] Catholic Church “most aptly terms Transubstantiation.” We suppose, also, that they meant it in a carnal and erroneous sense, that they say, “that the Body and Blood of “Christ is” not only “really,” but “*substantially* present in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist;” for “substantially” they explain to be not simply equivalent to “really,” but “corporeally¹,” that “the “Body of the LORD is *sensibly*² touched by the hands, “broken and bruised by the teeth.” Further, we think it presumptuous to define, as they do³, that “Christ is wholly contained under each species,” whereby they would excuse their modern innovation of denying the cup to the laity, and would persuade them by a self-invented and unauthorized theory of modern days, that they receive no detriment thereby. Again, we hold it rash to define peremptorily, “that⁴ the “Body and Blood of Christ remain in the consecrated “elements, which are not consumed, or are reserved “after the Communion,” (meaning thereby that they so remain, independently of any subsequent participation, as of the sick, or by the communicants,) although doubtless they are not common bread and wine, but hallowed. Then, also, we reject what Rome maintains under an anathema, “that⁵ “in the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ

¹ E. g. Bellarm. Controv. de Sac. Euch. L. 1. c. 11.

² Id. Ib. L. 3. c. 24.

³ L. c. cap. 3, and Can. 3.

⁴ Can. 4.

⁵ Can. 6.

“ the Only-begotten Son of God, is to be adored
 “ with the outward adoration of Divine worship, and,
 “ to be set forth publicly to the people, in order to
 “ be adored,” nay, “ that this most holy Sacrament
 “ rightly received the same Divine worship as is due
 “ to the true God ; and that it was not therefore the
 “ less to be adored, because instituted by Christ the
 “ Lord, to be received. For that the same Eternal
 “ God was present in it, Whom, when the Eternal
 “ Father brought into the world, He said, And let
 “ all the angels of God worship Him.” Lastly, as
 connected with and dependent upon Transubstantiation, we cannot but hold that the “ Sacrifice of
 “ masses, in the which it was commonly said that the
 “ Priest did offer Christ for the quick and dead, to
 “ have remission of pain and guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,” and interfere
 “ with the offering of Christ once made ” upon the
 Cross.

These are the modern corruptions of Rome, which our Church, in her Articles, condemns; and against these, which all spring from the one invention of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, we have repeatedly and often strongly spoken¹. We have specified the refusal of the cup to the laity, as *one* of the practical grievances of the Church of Rome, which should alone, without further disputing, restrain any from joining himself

¹ See Appendix, Nos. 14. 25. 31, 32, 33. 35. 49. 78. and reprint of Bp. Cosins, *ib.* Nos. 10, 11.

to her Communion¹. How it may be with those, who have access to no other, we have no right to determine, though one cannot doubt but that they sustain herein a grievous loss; and the miserable state of Roman Catholic countries in general, may be, in part, owing to this loss: but, for any voluntarily to cast himself out of a Communion, as our own, in the which he may receive it, and to join himself to that in which it is denied him, is such a wanton trifling with privileges, and casting away of God's gifts, and tempting of Him, that I should think this ground alone (which any plain man can understand) reason enough why no member of our Church should join her. It was felt, at the time of the Reformation, to be a very great practical cruelty; so much so, that observers of no mean note have not doubted, that it was the chief ground why the religious so earnestly sought for a Reformation, and that, had Rome conceded this point, the Reformation would never have taken place in the way in which it did. Rome admitted that her modern practice was contrary to the institution of our LORD, and contrary also to the mode in which the Church Universal, for nearly thirteen centuries of her existence, had interpreted that Institution²; but in that wantonness of authority,

¹ *Ib.* Nos. 14. 22.

² "This present holy general Council determines—that although Christ instituted the venerable Sacrament after supper, and administered it to His disciples under both kinds of bread and wine, yet, notwithstanding, the laudable authority of the

into which her assumed infallibility betrayed her, she preferred contravening Antiquity, and risking division, rather than abandon any practice which she had established, even though not, as she professes,

“ sacred Canons and the approved custom of the Church has and does observe, that this Sacrament ought not to be consecrated after supper, nor received by the faithful except fasting, except in case of sickness, &c. and in like way, that although this Sacrament was in the primitive Church received by the faithful under both kinds, yet to avoid any perils and scandals, the custom has with reason been introduced, that it be received by the officiating priests in both kinds, and by lay people, under the kind of bread only.” Council of Constance, sess. 13. Vasquez (quoted by Bp. Hall, ‘The Old Religion,’ c. 8.) says, “ We cannot deny that in the Latin Church there was the use of both kinds, and that it so continued until the days of St. Thomas, which was about the year of God, 1260.” “ Thus it was,” adds Bp. Hall, “ in the Roman Church ; but as for the Greek, the world knows it never did communicate but under both kinds. These open confessions spare us the labour of quoting the several testimonies of later ages.”

This instance illustrates the difference between the mode in which Anglo and Roman-Catholics view the relation of the Church to Holy Scripture ; Anglo-Catholics take the two facts, that the Church never did consecrate after supper, but always did administer in two kinds, as an authoritative interpretation of our LORD’S will, and supposes that He willed what He did to be followed in the one case not in the other : the Romish Church regards the former only as a proof of the dispensing power of the Church, and so proceeds to dispense in the other, *contrary* to primitive practice. Thus, Anglo-Catholics take the Primitive Church in both cases as a witness ; Romanists make her a judge, and as establishing a precedent only, which the existing Church may follow out at her own discretion.

matter of faith. Yet she would not depart from her existing customs, or the tradition of two centuries; and so being unable to justify herself on Scripture, as explained by Antiquity, she had recourse to *à priori* grounds, "that ¹ it is most firmly to " be believed, and no wise to be doubted, that the " whole Body and Blood of Christ is truly contained " as well under the form of bread as under the form " of wine." Miserable and rationalistic arguments in Divine Mysteries! as if, where all is subject of Faith, there were any safe rule but to adhere as closely as possible to what seems to be the Divine Ordinance. It seems strange that that misguided Church should not have felt the risk of declaring what the Church Universal had of old esteemed part of the Divine Institution, to be superfluous, and did not dread thus tempting God to withdraw His grace altogether, which they thus presumptuously argued about. This rationalistic argument was met in its own way, that if additional grace were not bestowed through the communion of the Cup, then " the ² administering Priest received no " benefit from it, and (painful as it is to state it) it " was wholly useless and indifferent." Thus a feigned reverence, (lest haply some accident should befall the consecrated element,) covered a real irreverence;

¹ Council of Constance, l. c.

² By many Theologians even of the Council of Trent. Sarpi, L. 6. c. 30. where several other arguments are given.

and real unbelief as to the Virtue of the Sacramental Blood was veiled by a scrupulous care for Its protection. So it ever is, when men forget that “to obey is better than Sacrifice,” and would be more jealous for the honour of holy things, than GOD who gave them. The honour of the Eucharist was alleged; the honour of man was the secret motive, lest by concession of the Cup to the laity, the dignity of the Priesthood should be levelled¹. But thus Rome, rashly binding itself to the hasty and presumptuous decision of the Council of Constance, has inflicted a grievous privation upon her own members, and placed a mark upon herself, which must ever be a hindrance to her own power, and prevent her recovering her undue sway over our Church. An instinctive devotion will guide and protect the religious members of our Church, who might otherwise have been just the most alive to the splendour of many of her pretensions. They might not be able to disentangle their way amid abstract arguments; but they will feel that it would be a loss to be deprived of their SAVIOUR’S Blood. Those who engage unprepared in abstract controversies may relapse; the devout Communicant will be safe, who argues not but obeys. All which Rome could give them, they have already in the Church wherein they were baptized; and they have more. Not here to mention the risk of forfeiture which might be in-

¹ Tridentine Theologians, ap. Sarpi, l. c. especially the Spanish, ib. c. 31.

volved in joining what is here a Schismatic Communion, our Church, though she rightly reject the Sacrifice of Masses, has ever been acknowledged to have that whereof it is the corruption, the true commemorative Sacrifice, representing to GOD the Death and Passion of His Son, and so acceptable to Him, such as the Church Catholic ever held it ¹; she has the true Communion of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, administered by those ordained by the successors of the Apostles, and that, unimpaired by any "will-worship or voluntary "humility," which pretending a self-invented respect, would deprive the laity of a portion of their inheritance and of GOD's gift. We need not now put ourselves in the position that Rome would concede this, and retain her other corruptions ²; to concede it, Rome must be other than she now is; a strong ground for refusing it was, lest other demands should be made of her ³. Why then distract ourselves with such gratuitous hypotheses that Rome would concede, what

¹ See Catena, No. 4. Tracts, No. 81, "Testimony of writers of "the later English Church to the doctrine of the Eucharistic "Sacrifice, with an historical account of the changes made in the "Liturgy as to the expression of that doctrine." Courayer, *Dé-fense de la Dissert. sur la Validité des Ordinations Anglaises*, l. 4. c. 6.

² *Essays on the Church*, p. 292.

³ This was urged by the Spanish Bishops, and those dependant upon Spain, who were the chief opposers of the concession of the Cup at the Council of Trent, Sarpi, l. 6. c. 31. and influenced the legates to resist the united applications of the Imperial and French Ambassadors, *ib.* c. 35.

for above four centuries she has not conceded? Why suppose that what she refused, when pressed by people and Emperors¹, when she might thereby have retained whole Churches in her Communion, she would now grant in the hope of recovering a few individuals, and thereby own herself doubly in error? Why embarrass ourselves with imagining that what she refused at Trent because she had refused it at Constance, she should now concede, although she has sanctioned by an anathema² the *à priori* ground upon which she refused it? She can concede it only on the supposition that the urgent

¹ The Ambassadors of the Emperor and of Bavaria were especially urgent at the Council of Trent, for the restoration of the Cup; they were joined by those of France, Sarpi, l. vi. c. 35. The Imperial Ambassadors urged that there "were Catholics in Hungary, Austria, Moravia, Silesia, Carinthia, Carniola, Styria, Bavaria, Suabia, and other parts of Germany, who ardently desired the cup;" in Hungary they went so far, as to "oblige the Priests, by depriving them of their goods, and threatening of their life, to administer the Cup to them." The Imperial and Bavarian ambassadors continued to urge the Council, and the Pope both during its Session, and after its close. Sarpi, ib. c. 53; vii. 47; viii. 88. Cassander (ap. Bp. Hall, l. c.) says, "Wherefore not without cause are most of the best Catholics, and most conversant in the reading of Ecclesiastical writers, inflamed with an earnest desire of obtaining the Cup of the Lord; that the Sacrament may be brought back to that ancient custom and use, which hath been for many ages perpetuated in the Universal Church." "We need," adds Bp. Hall, "no other advocate."

² Sess. 21. can. 3.

demand of it is reasonable; but she has anathematized those "who deny that Jesus Christ, the "Author and Source of all grace, is received "wholly and entirely under one species," and so has cut herself off from thinking the demand reasonable; and yet, by the strange destiny annexed to these presumptuous reasonings, she has elsewhere awakened the suspicion of loss attached to the denial of the Cup, which she would here allay. For since many members of the Synod of Trent did think it a loss ¹, she was constrained elsewhere simply to state, "that ² the faithful who receive under the "one species of bread are not deprived of any grace "necessary to salvation," and so, as was at the time remarked ³, she "in a manner avowed that they are "deprived of some grace, though not absolutely "necessary. Whereupon they asked, has any human "authority the power to hinder the super-abundant "and non-necessary grace of God? and if so, does "charity admit of thus placing hindrances in the way "of good?" Thus she has placed herself in the position of making unauthorized distinctions as to the grace necessary for us in working out our salvation, and exhibits herself as an unnatural mother, who half-recognizes that what she withholds is a blessing, and yet refuses it.

But, so closely do faithful adherence to Apostolic

¹ Visconti ap. Courayer, notes to Sarpi, l. 6. c. 39.

² Sess. 21. cap. 3.

³ Remarks on the Decree recorded by Sarpi, l. c.

doctrine and to Apostolic practice accompany each other, it is plain, my Lord, that it is only upon the high Catholic doctrine of the Holy Communion, that the denial of the Cup is a privation. They who receive the holy elements faithfully, acknowledge, as they receive each consecrated element, that they are receiving respectively. "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for" them, and His Blood which was for them shed. They reason not, how His Body is separate from His Blood, or what additional blessing the Communion of His Blood bestows upon them. Instinctive reverence, the fruit of reverent Communion, forbids them to enquire or to risk a forfeiture. They pray, "that their sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and their souls washed by His most precious Blood;" they hear, severally, the ancient and hallowed words of the Universal Church, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ," . . . "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ;" and with an unreasoning piety, which has a mightier hold than any subtilty of Romanist distinction, they would dread to forfeit either portion of the Gift bestowed upon them. But upon any Ultra-Protestant theory, which regards the consecrated elements as "visible symbols of His *absent* Body and Blood," as representations, means of kindling our faith, and the like, the privation of the Cup were no loss. Whosoever having embraced this theory, should continue to regard it as such, must do so by virtue of a piety which his theory had not mastered. It is the *reality* of the Communication of

His Blood by *means* of those forms which He has instituted to convey It, which makes "the Cup which we bless" a blessing, its loss a privation. They who think of the Holy Symbols, as outward only, may retain them as an act of obedience, (and so far is well,) but cannot feel it an essential Blessing. And thus, my Lord, it again appears how a jealous adherence to the high Catholic Doctrines of Antiquity is at the same time a safeguard to retain the affections of our people. Such is not our *end*; but it is a *reward* annexed to faithfulness. Whether those who blame us for insisting so much upon this practical cruelty of the Church of Rome, would themselves feel it as a cruelty, or adequately appreciate the blessings which they enjoy through the restoration of Primitive practice in our Church, is for them to determine.

On the other hand, our Church, as holding the original Catholic truth, of which the corruptions of Rome are the debasement, appears to me yet further removed from those modern traditions, the inventions of men who deny that truth. Rome, in this respect, has the truth, though mingled with error, and clouded and injured by it; the Zuingli-Calvinist School have forfeited it. In a word, our Church holds with Rome the *reality* of the Communication of the Body and Blood of CHRIST through the Holy Eucharist, but denies her carnal way of explaining it, and protests against the corruptions thereby entailed; but in what Rome retains of truth,

she must needs hold with her against those who explaining to human reason Divine mysteries, cannot but explain away what is mysterious, and resolve the hidden gifts of the Sacrament into aids of contemplation, outward attestations of GOD's gifts, exhibitions to our outward senses, mere remembrancers of His Death.

I would only observe, in conclusion of this topic, that I wish not to ascribe to our accusers the whole extent of Zuinglian doctrine, however I must think that they fall short of the doctrines of our Church. Happily, the faith of individuals is so sustained by the Liturgy of our Church, that few carry out the erroneous notions of a foreign school, even while they form their minds in it, or embrace detached views out of it. I wish not to speak of individuals, but of systems; individuals, I doubt not, are better than their systems, and far other than their system would be, if developed without restraint; the devotions of our Church have influenced such of her members far more than they are probably themselves aware, and have conveyed to them truth, which they are afraid to express in words, lest it should tend to the exaltation of what seems to them outward; we would not blame *them*; we would only wish to exhibit to them the system which they have partially embraced, that they might extricate themselves wholly from it.

Art. XXIII. *Of ministering in the Congregation.*

We have no objection to admit that the Articles of Edward VI., from which our present are, with some modifications, derived, were formed upon a plan of comprehension; it is an historical¹ fact that, although the scheme failed, they were intended as a general basis of union of Protestants in one Episcopal body. Nor does there seem any necessity that a Church, whose ministers are episcopally ordained, should put forth any formal statement that they must of necessity be so. We therefore acquiesce very readily in the indefiniteness of our Article on this head, which states that we ought "to judge those lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men, who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard," without defining who are invested with this authority. For if any one be willing himself to receive Ordination at the hands of a Bishop, surely, my Lord, nothing further is gained by requiring him to confess that this is the only lawful Ordination. But comprehensive Articles are not at the same time exclusive. Our Articles surely are not in such wise a rule of belief, that we are to hold nothing for true which is not contained in them; we are not bound to have no opinion *beside* them, provided we hold

¹ See authorities, Tract 81. p. 27. *note.*

none *against* them. Yet this is what these charges come to. The compilers of the Articles, intending them for subscription, *required* no more definite opinion upon the subject; therefore, say these, they forbade it. But the Articles are not the only, often not the fullest, statements of the doctrines or tenets of our Church. They are often to be interpreted or to be filled up out of her other documents. Thus as, on the Sacraments, the teaching of the Articles is materially cleared and filled up by the Catechism and the Services, so, on Ordination, a consistent Churchman would naturally have recourse to those services to which in her Articles (Art. XXXVI.) she refers. The Preface then to “the Form and Manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons,” thus speaks :

“ It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and ancient Authors, that *from the Apostles’ time*, there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ’s Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.—And therefore to the intent that these Orders may be *continued*, and reverently used and esteemed, in the united Church of England and Ireland, no man shall be accounted and taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the united Church of England and Ireland, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.”

For herself, then, clearly our Church regards none to be lawfully consecrated or ordained except those who have received Episcopal Consecration or Ordination; and, in her practice, conformably to this rule, she admits a Romish Priest, who relinquishes his errors, to exercise his functions without reordination, but not one who has received Presbyterian Ordination. The principles, however, of this Preface go further; for Episcopacy is stated to be an Apostolic Ordinance, and if Apostolic, then Divine. And this view I need not say has been held by the great stream of our Divines¹; nor, having an Apostolic Ordinance, have men, until lately, been ashamed to avow it.

It would then be altogether inexplicable how the avowal of what is commonly entitled "Apostolical succession" should have been received with so much tumult, had one not reason to believe, that many of the anonymous writers, who have been for some years raising it, belong to bodies which have forfeited that Ordinance.

Leaving these, however, I might take this occasion to remove some of the misconceptions which have been raised about it. The objection is ordinarily thus couched: "If the Sacraments are necessary to salvation, and can only be administered by one Episcopally ordained, then among Presbyterian bodies, there are no Sacraments, and consequently no sal-

¹ See *Catena Patrum*, No. 1. *Tracts*, No. 74.

“vation, or at least they are left to the uncovenanted mercies of God.”

Yet to make deductions from a doctrine, is not the safest way of understanding it. Men in these days are not apt to infer, that because there is no salvation except through the Name of JESUS CHRIST, therefore all the Heathen must be condemned; nay, though our Articles say, that they are to be “held accursed that presume to say that every one shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature,” (Art. XVIII.), people are content to stop short, resting in the positive revealed truth, that salvation is through CHRIST alone; but not enquiring “who then shall be saved?”

And within these same bounds we have confined ourselves. Episcopacy and Presbyterianism (as excluding Episcopacy) cannot be true together, any more than any other two opposites. If Episcopacy be Apostolic and an ordinance of GOD, Presbyterianism is not; if Presbyterianism is, then Episcopacy is not; and this was ever so held until these modern days, when men have consented to merge their differences in a common indifference; and is probably still held by the Dissenters from our Church. For they felt that to justify their schism, it was necessary to show that our Church required things unlawful, and Episcopacy was accordingly counted among the signs that our Church was a portion of Antichrist. Episcopacy was denounced as Antichristian¹.

¹ See *e. g.* Archbishop Bramhall quoted below p. 165. Beza.

Without imitating their harshness, we, in our turn, would say, since Episcopacy is an Ordinance of GOD, to abandon it is sin ; the degree of that sin, or its effects, we are not called upon to pronounce on, nor would we. Only, as watchmen, we are bound to warn against this, as against every other sin ; and the more against this, because men are now so careless about it. Even Calvin spoke very differently when he said, “ they are worthy of any Anathema, “ who¹ when they can have Bishops, have them not.” So neither then would we take upon ourselves to say any thing as to the efficacy of the Sacraments administered by those, whom we cannot hold to have been rightly ordained. We hold only that they have not *duly received the commission* to administer them. And this will be plain to any Presbyter, if he make the case his own. As Presbyters, we *received no Commission*, either alone, or in conjunction with others, to ordain others to dispense the word of GOD, and His holy Sacraments ; and what we have not received, we cannot give. That word and those Sacraments

divides Episcopacy into Divine, human, and Satanic. Divine according to him, is the ministry generally ; human, is the placing one Presbyter above the rest with limited authority ; Satanic, is where the Episcopacy is entirely separate from the Presbytery, and has exclusive authority. This is repeated by the Puritan writers in their answers of the English Church, *e. g.* Calderwood, *Altare Damascenum*, c. 4. yet Beza himself, said of our Bishops, “ Let her enjoy this singular bounty of God, which “ I wish she may hold for ever.” (Quoted by Bp. Hall, *Episcopacy by Divine right*, p. 1. c. 4.)

¹ See Bp. Hall, *Episcopacy by Divine right*, p. i. c. 2.

we do administer, because we have been commissioned so to do; we do not pretend to empower others, because, not being commissioned, we have not been empowered. In like manner, neither Luther nor Wesley, (any more than Calvin, who was himself never ordained,) had any commission, by themselves, or with other Presbyters, to ordain others; and so those ordained by them *have received no commission* to administer the Sacraments. Mere length of time cannot mend the original invalidity. And this original difficulty seems to have been felt alike by Luther and Wesley. It is well known that Wesley reluctantly took the step of ordaining at all; that he meant those whom he ordained, to be subordinate auxiliaries to the ministry; and that, to the last, he refused, in the strongest terms, his consent that those thus ordained should take upon them to administer the Sacraments¹; he felt that it exceeded his powers, and so inhibited it, however it might diminish the numbers of the society he had framed. In like manner Luther, as has been observed², gave to those ordained by him, new titles; not venturing to attribute

¹ He was consulted how to proceed with a society, who threatened to leave the Connection, unless permitted to have the Sacraments administered by their own preachers. His answer was, "Modern laziness has jumbled together the two distinct offices of preaching and administering the Sacraments. But, be that as it may, I will rather lose twenty societies than separate from the Church." This was only about three years before his death. The letter was first published in the Brit. Mag. vol. vi. p. 297.

² Palmer on the Church, pt. i. c. 12. sect. 4. t. i. p. 387.

to them those belonging to the offices conferred by the regular ordination. But irregular practice is the parent of irregular principles; and the wider deviation incident to that practice begets a new train of principles. Man must justify himself in his own sight; if then he conform not his practice to his principles, his practice will bend his principles. The legality of even Presbyterian Ordination, the theory, that the right of Ordination resides "in the body corporate of the Church"¹ (to be of any use in this argument it must be "in any section of the Church"), these and the like, are so many after thoughts to justify what was done in the first instance on Saul's plea of "necessity;" "I² forced myself therefore, and offered a burnt-offering."

But while maintaining that they only are *commissioned* to administer the Sacraments, who have received that commission from those appointed in succession to bestow it, we have never denied that GOD *may* make His own Sacraments efficacious, even when irregularly administered; we should trust it might be so: some of us are bound up by ties of affection to those very Protestant bodies, which it is supposed we should so harshly and wantonly cut off from the Church of CHRIST. The very same affection for them which would make us long to see them safely restored to the full privileges of the Church, makes us trust that the Father of mercies has not

¹ Episcopacy, Tradition, and the Sacraments, considered in reference to the Oxford Tracts, p. 21.

² 1 Sam. xiii. 12.

“one blessing” only, but has “a blessing for them
“also, even for them.”

Still every one would apprehend risk in certain cases of irregularity: few, for instance, would think themselves safe in receiving the LORD'S Supper from a layman or from a woman; and the greater the irregularity, and the less excuse for it, the greater would be esteemed the risk. Thus dissenters would obviously run greater risk of having the efficacy of the Sacraments diminished, than the present Presbyterians of Scotland; and these perhaps more than the German bodies, whose forefathers did not wilfully renounce the privilege of Episcopacy, and have not a pure Apostolic Church with which they might unite, nor have had before their eyes the instructive example of her patient and suffering piety. Nor, again, are we called upon to think what mitigating effect inveterate prejudice may have; the present Protestants have been brought into their state not by their own deed, but by the acts of former generations. Their continuance in that state may be an evil and a loss of privileges, entailed upon them by the act of their forefathers, which they have not cut off; but not the same to individuals as if they had been the authors of it. On the other hand, it is for them to consider that they have not the same plea of necessity which their forefathers urged; that they may readily repair the irregularity for the future; that such an act would doubtless be pleasing to GOD, as evincing an anxiety to conform themselves altogether to His will, and so might bring down a blessing on them-

selves, as well as contribute to the ultimate restoration of unity in the whole Church.

But our immediate practical question is at home. And what Churchman would venture to say that none of the dissenters, that no shade of them, run *any* risk? that people were *equally safe* as to the LORD'S Supper, however administered? that if administered by the congregation to each other, that if a family were to administer it among themselves, they would be *quite secure*? And if there is risk in dispensing with a Minister altogether, why should men be quite certain that there is none in dispensing with one Apostolically ordained? why should we think it an unreasonable thing, that risk should be involved in neglecting an Ordinance of GOD? The Church of old held that the efficacy of the Sacraments, even when administered by ordained but schismatic ministers, was, at the least, suspended, so long as persons remained in Schism. This is the ground which we have taken, not involving ourselves and others needlessly in questions as to GOD'S dealings with others, but providing, as far as in us lay, for the safety of our own people. We have told them, that, at the least, they are safer if they abide in the Church. I might cite to this end, one of the earliest tracts¹ in this

¹ Tract 4. p. 3. The question, "Do you then unchurch all the "Presbyterians?" was also there answered, p. 5, and many hard words might have been saved, had persons read what is said in the Tracts, instead of making inferences from them, unread. The kirk of Scotland was also kindly spoken of, in the very poem, so often cited in proof of want of charity towards it; "Samaria."

series, when the Apostolic succession, being so lost out of sight, was more continually put forward than there is, happily, now, any occasion to do. "Jesus Christ's own commission is the best external security I can have, that in receiving this bread and wine, I verily receive His Body and Blood. Either the Bishops have that commission, or there is no such thing in the world. For, at least, Bishops have it with as much evidence as Presbyters without them. In proportion, then, to my Christian anxiety for keeping as near my Saviour as I can, I shall of course be very unwilling to separate myself from Episcopal communion. And in proportion to

There is certainly an analogy between the proceedings of Jeroboam and those of John Knox. The making of the calves, although eminently, "*the* sin wherewith Jeroboam made Israel to sin" was not his only sin : it is added, "he made priests out of all the people, which were not of the sons of Levi," (the Hebrew word means rather, "out of the people, indiscriminately," than as in the E. V. "of the lowest of the people,") and these were to offer not to the calves, but "on the high-places," where the true God was worshipped, though not as He had appointed. This sin then was a self-chosen ordination. And this Scotland likewise committed, in rejecting Episcopacy, which she already had in a pure Church. As God, however, left not Samaria without seers, so also has He raised up gifted men for Scotland, and has doubtless among those, who have forsaken the Apostolic Church, His 7000, who have not been involved in any of the further consequences of that first sin. Tract 47 (on the "Visible Church," No. 4), contains a warm statement how the sense of the superior privileges of our Church is compatible with charity, and tends to individual humility.

“ my charitable care for others, will be my industry
 “ to preserve and extend the like consolation and
 “ security to them.” And again ¹, “ Why should we
 “ talk so much of an ‘ establishment’, and so little of
 “ an ‘ Apostolical Succession?’ Why should we not
 “ seriously endeavour to impress *our people* with
 “ this plain truth—that by separating themselves
 “ from our communion, they separate themselves not
 “ only from a decent, orderly, useful society, but
 “ from the only Church in this realm which *has a*
 “ *right to be quite sure* that she has the Lord’s Body to
 “ give to the people.”

And this language does not at all go beyond the glowing words of Hooker, in vindicating the divine commission which must necessarily belong to “ the ministry in things divine.” And he too, however he might make allowances for cases of apparent necessity (which was the more natural in those times, when the tendency of Ultra-Protestantism had not been developed), held that the Episcopal Ordination was the only authorized transmission of that authority². He says then ³ . . . “ In that they are Christ’s ambassadors and His labourers, who should give them their commission, but He Whose most inward affairs they manage? Is not God alone the Father

¹ Tract 4. p. 5.

² See Mr. Keble’s Preface to Hooker, p. lxx.—lxx.

³ Eccl. Pol. V. lxxvii. 1, 2. 7. ed. Keble, quoted Tracts, No. 74. Catena, No. 1. “ Testimony of writers in the later English Church to the doctrine of the Apostolical succession.”

“ of spirits? Are not souls the purchase of Jesus
 “ Christ? What angel in heaven could have said
 “ to man, as our Lord did unto Peter, ‘Feed My
 “ sheep,—preach—baptize—do this in remembrance
 “ of Me. Whose sins ye retain, they are retained;
 “ and their offences in heaven pardoned, whose
 “ faults you shall on earth forgive?’ What think
 “ we? Are these terrestrial sounds, or else are
 “ they voices uttered out of the clouds above? The
 “ power of the ministry of God translatheth out of
 “ darkness into glory; it raiseth man from the
 “ earth and bringeth God Himself from heaven; *by*
 “ *blessing visible elements it maketh them invisible*
 “ *graces*; it giveth daily the Holy Ghost; *it hath to*
 “ *dispose of that flesh which was given for the life of*
 “ *the world, and the Blood which was poured out to*
 “ *redeem souls*; when it poureth malediction upon
 “ the heads of the wicked, they perish; when it re-
 “ voketh the same, they revive. O wretched blind-
 “ ness, if we admire not so great power; more
 “ wretched, if we consider it aright, and notwith-
 “ standing, imagine that any but God can bestow it!
 “ To whom Christ hath imparted power, both over
 “ that mystical body which is the society of souls,
 “ and over that natural which is Himself, for the
 “ knitting of both in one (a work which Antiquity
 “ doth call the making of Christ’s Body), the same
 “ power is in such not amiss both termed a kind of
 “ mark or character, and acknowledged to be inde-
 “ lible. ‘Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins

“ soever ye remit, they are remitted ; whose sins ye
“ retain, they are retained.’ Whereas, therefore, the
“ other Evangelists had set down, that Christ did, be-
“ fore His suffering, promise to give His Apostles the
“ keys of the kingdom of heaven, and being risen
“ from the dead, promised moreover at that time a
“ miraculous power of the Holy Ghost, St. John
“ addeth, that He also invested them even then
“ with the power of the Holy Ghost for castigation
“ and relaxation of sin, wherein was fully accom-
“ plished that which the promise of the keys did im-
“ port. Seeing, therefore, that the same power is
“ now given, why should the same form of words
“ expressing it be thought foolish ?”

We would speak then, my Lord, as we have spoken, *positively* ; we would point out to those who are of our Communion, this security in remaining in her, to those who, or their forefathers, have deserted her, the superior safety in returning to her. The argument, that they only can lawfully administer in Divine things, who have been called thereto, is so plain, and so impressed upon men’s minds by natural reverence, that such as have had no outward call, have ever rested their claim upon an inward call ; and so acknowledge the principle : but however men have in this way persuaded themselves that they were called to preach the word, no one, I believe, ever yet imagined himself so called to administer the Sacraments. Indeed the general tendency of this class has been to neglect the Sacraments, and

substitute preaching for them, following that to which they conceived themselves called, and magnifying it to the derogation of the Ordinances, to administer which they had no call. The administration of the Sacraments, when it has been ventured upon, has generally been, as in the case of the Wesleyans, a subsequent expedient, to round a system, and make it independent of the Church. We doubt not, then, but that by GOD's blessing, the more courageous avowal of the undoubted privileges of our Apostolic Church would regain many of her lost children to her, and save her from having to deplore the loss of others, would check the growth of schism, and tend to heal her breaches. And the vehemence with which this principle has been attacked by Dissenters, might show men that its importance has been felt by those without also; they would not trouble themselves about the maintenance of an abstract principle, unless they saw its tendency (which has already to some extent been realized), to strengthen the Church, and to diminish the several secessions from it. To these, our own Church's erring children, is our first duty. Yet may it perhaps not be too much to hope, that the more complete developement of the principles of our Church, may influence also those religious bodies, the foreign Protestants, about which persons profess so much concern. And thus the time may be hastened, when we may be all "one fold under One Shepherd." Certainly, if we have been intrusted with privileges, which other reformed bodies lost, it was not, that they should be "put under a bushel, but on a candle-

“stick, that” our “candle which our God hath lighted for us may give light to all them that are in the house.” It were ungrateful to ALMIGHTY GOD, Who amid so many perils, some common to the general “breaking up of the fountains of the great deep” whereby the previous corruptions were cleansed, others peculiar to our own land, still provided that our Ark should be borne safe above the waters; it were real unkindness to other bodies of Christians, to dissemble our privileges, and not rather to glory in them and in Him who gave them, that others may be kindled with a godly zeal, and behold, and partake of them.

Although, however, we have been careful not to go beyond our measure, and have not needlessly spoken of other bodies, yet may it be useful to allude to one remarkable fact bearing on this question. The doctrine of Apostolical succession and that of the Sacraments, viewed in the abstract, would to most, probably, not seem at first sight to be so connected together, that a false view of the one would involve error upon the other; much less, that the denial of the one should entail a fundamental change in the other. Yet so it has been. It seems as though people had been deterred by an instinctive dread from taking *upon themselves* the office of administering the Holy Eucharist, with the full consciousness of its mysteriousness. It is too awful for man to undertake unbidden; he cannot invest *himself* with the belief that in Hooker's words, “in blessing visible elements” he has the power to “make

them invisible grace", any more than he can give *himself* the commission so to do : man's belief in this awful privilege, so surpassing human thought, must come from above ; he can only believe it, when he has solemnly been invested with it. Accordingly, where people have acted without this commission, there they have unconsciously lowered the doctrine. In the thoughts of many Wesleyans, at least, " means " of grace" will signify—not the Holy Eucharist, but their own peculiar discipline, their " class meetings" or their " love-feasts." They have often lost even the abstract belief, that the Holy Communion is any way more solemn, or attended with more mysterious blessing. With a ministry " not of the sons " of Levi¹," they have " ordained a feast" also " like " unto the feast which is in Judah," and have come to think their own feast, which they had " devised of " their own heart," to be as acceptable to God, and as rich in blessing to them as that " ordained by Christ " Himself." And so likewise as to other bodies ; the further any have departed from the doctrine of the Apostolic succession, so much the lower has their doctrine of the Sacraments become ; as at the very outset, the system of Luther, (himself a Priest,) though in part erroneous, was higher than that of Calvin and Zuingli, who were laymen. And yet now after the lapse of three centuries, even the peculiar doctrine of Lutheranism is well nigh extinct ; those who

¹ 1 Kings xii. 31—33.

maintain it are, in one large country of the reformation, a proscribed sect. Mostly, it has amalgamated itself with the Calvinistic doctrine. Shrinking then from saying any thing as to God's dealings with individuals, it would yet seem that, upon their own scheme of doctrine, the Holy Eucharist must be to many bodies, at least, other than it is to us. For what we believe it to be, that they reject. They do not believe that it conveys really, though spiritually, the Body and Blood of CHRIST; painful as it is to say, they repudiate as Popish, the real, invisible, Presence of CHRIST; they resolve into a figure the real actual Indwelling of CHRIST thereby. Since then faith is the means, whereby *we* become partakers of the gifts already stored up for us, what would there be harsh or unkind in thinking that they had not, what they deny themselves to have? especially when our object is to persuade them to return where they may believe and may have it? It is the substance of their own statement, when one says, in a passage¹ singled out for blame, "In the judgment of the Church, the Eucharist administered without Apostolical commission, may to pious minds be a very edifying ceremony, but it is not that blessed thing which our Saviour graciously meant it to be; it is not 'verily and indeed taking and receiving' the Body and Blood of Him, our Incarnate Lord." For they themselves so speak of

¹ Tract 66. p. 7.

it, as an outward means to kindle faith; they place the very essence of Sacraments in their instructiveness¹; what injury then is done them, if any say that they have not, what they refuse? or why may we not claim to our own Church, what she professes to receive from GOD's all-gracious hand? What they claim, is not denied them; we trust that the "edifying rite" which they hold the Communion to be, may be, by GOD's mercy, beneficial to them; why should they grudge us its being to us "that blessed thing which we believe our Saviour graciously meant it to be." If they will not "enter in themselves," why should they "hinder those who are entering?"

This view of the case, whereby we are enabled to maintain uncompromisingly the truth, and yet to entertain kindly and charitable and sympathetic feelings for those who have lost some of the privileges of our Church, is so fully and so tenderly put by the great Bramhall, that I would again extract his words; and our previous selection of them might have shown people our sentiments, would they have read before they blamed.

"But² because I esteem them Churches not completely formed, do I, therefore, exclude them from

¹ See Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism, p. 122-4. 245. ed. 1.

² Vindication of the Church of England, disc. 3. quoted more fully Tracts, No. 74. Catena on the "Apostolical succession," p. 12, 13. It appears from Abp. Bramhall, that the charge of want of charity for maintaining the Apostolical succession was then brought by the Romanists.

“ all hopes of salvation ? or esteem them aliens from
 “ the commonwealth of Israel ? or account them
 “ formal schismatics ? No such thing. First, I know
 “ there are many learned persons among them who
 “ do passionately affect Episcopacy ; some of which
 “ have acknowledged it to myself, that their Church
 “ would never be rightly settled, until it was new
 “ moulded¹. Baptism is a Sacrament, the door of
 “ Christianity, a matriculation into the Church of
 “ Christ : yet the very desire of it in case of necessity,
 “ is sufficient to excuse from the want of actual
 “ Baptism. And is not the desire of Episcopacy
 “ sufficient to excuse from the actual want of Epis-
 “ copacy, in like case of necessity ? or should I cen-
 “ sure these as schismatics ?

“ Secondly, there are others, who though they do
 “ not long so much for Episcopacy, yet they approve
 “ it, and want it only out of invincible necessity.
 “ In some places the sovereign is of another com-
 “ munion ; the Episcopal chairs are filled with Roman
 “ Bishops. If they should petition for Bishops of
 “ their own, it would not be granted. In other
 “ places the magistrates have taken away Bishops ;
 “ whether out of policy, because they thought that

¹ It were difficult to point out the difference between this ad-
 mission of the “ Reformed” themselves, and a saying of Mr.
 Froude’s, selected for censure, as referring to the “ Reformation,
 “ every where but in England.” (Essays, p. 285.) “ The reforma-
 “ tion was a limb badly set—it must be broken again in order to
 “ be righted.” Remains, vol. i. p. 433.

“ the regiment not so proper for their republics, or
 “ because they were ashamed to take away the
 “ revenues, and preserve the order, or out of a blind
 “ zeal, they have given an account to God: they
 “ owe none to me. Should I condemn all these as
 “ schismatics for want of Episcopacy, who want it
 “ out of invincible necessity?

“ Thirdly, there are others who have neither the
 “ same desires, nor the same esteem of Episcopacy,
 “ but condemn it as an Antichristian innovation, and
 “ a rag of Popery. I conceive this to be most gross
 “ schism materially. It is ten times more schisma-
 “ tical to desert, nay, to take away (so much as lies
 “ in them) the whole order of Bishops, than to sub-
 “ tract obedience from one lawful Bishop. All that
 “ can be said to mitigate this fault is, that they do it
 “ ignorantly, as they have been mistaught and mis-
 “ informed. And I hope that many of them are free
 “ from obstinacy, and hold the truth implicitly in the
 “ preparation of their minds, being ready to receive
 “ it when God shall reveal it to them. How far this
 “ may excuse (not the crime but) their persons from
 “ formal schism, either *à toto* or *à tanto*, I determine
 “ not, but leave them to stand or fall to their own
 “ Master.”

And again, in answer to the same charge whereto
 we are subjected, of having “ a design to bring the
 “ Pope into England,” in that they “ unchurch either
 “ all or most of the Protestant Churches, and maintain
 “ the Roman Church and not their’s to be true :”

“ His¹ assumption is wanting, which should be
 “ this: but a considerable party of Episcopal divines
 “ in England do unchurch all or most of the Protes-
 “ tant Churches, and maintain the Roman Church to
 “ be a true Church, and these to be no Churches. I
 “ can assent to neither of his propositions, nor to any
 “ part of them, as true, *sub modo*, as they are al-
 “ leged by him.

“ First, I cannot assent to his major proposition,
 “ that all those who make an ordinary personal
 “ uninterrupted succession of Pastors, to be of the
 “ integrity of a true Church, (which is the ground of
 “ his exception,) have, therefore, an intention, or
 “ can justly be suspected thereupon to have any
 “ intention, to introduce the Pope. The Eastern,
 “ Southern, and Northern Churches are all of them
 “ for such a personal succession, and yet all of them
 “ utter enemies to the Pope. Secondly, I cannot
 “ assent to his minor proposition, that either all or
 “ any considerable part of the Episcopal divines in
 “ England, do unchurch either all or most part of the
 “ Protestant Churches. No man is hurt but by him-
 “ self. They unchurch none at all, but leave them
 “ to stand or fall to their own Master. They do not
 “ unchurch the Swedish, Danish, Bohemian, Churches,
 “ and many other Churches in Polonia, Hungaria,
 “ and those parts of the world, who have an ordinary
 “ uninterrupted succession of Pastors, some by the

¹ Vindication of Grotius, disc. 3. quoted ib. p. 14 & 16.

“ name of Bishops, others under the name of Seniors,
 “ unto this day ; (I meddle not with the Socinians :)
 “ they unchurch not the Lutheran Churches in Ger-
 “ many, who both assert Episcopacy in their confes-
 “ sions, and have actual superintendents in their
 “ practice, and would have Bishops, name and thing,
 “ if it were in their power. Let him not mistake
 “ himself: those Churches which he is so tender of,
 “ though they be better known to us by reason of
 “ their vicinity, are so far from being ‘ all or most
 “ part of the Protestant Churches,’ that being all put
 “ together, they amount not to so great a proportion
 “ as the Britannick Churches alone. And if one
 “ excluded out of them all those who want an ordi-
 “ nary succession without their own faults, out of
 “ invincible ignorance or necessity, and all those who
 “ desire to have an ordinary succession either ex-
 “ plicitly or implicitly, they will be reduced to a
 “ little flock indeed.

“ But let him set his heart at rest. I will remove
 “ this scruple out of his mind, that he may sleep
 “ securely upon both ears. Episcopal divines do not
 “ deny those Churches to be true Churches, wherein
 “ salvation may be had. We advise them, as it is
 “ our duty, to be circumspect for themselves, and
 “ not to put it to more question, whether they have
 “ ordination or not, or desert the general practice of
 “ the universal Church for nothing, when they may
 “ clear it if they please. Their case is not the same
 “ with those who labour under invincible necessity.

“ What mine own sense is of it, I have declared
 “ many years since to the world in print ; and in the
 “ same way received thanks, and a public acknow-
 “ ledgment of my moderation from a French divine.
 “ And yet more particularly in my reply to the
 “ Bishop of Chalcedon, Pres. p. 144. and cap. 1. p.
 “ 164. Episcopal divines will readily subscribe to
 “ the determination of the learned Bishop of Win-
 “ chester, in his answer to the Second Epistle of
 “ Molineus. ‘ Nevertheless, if our form (of Episco-
 “ pacy) be of divine right, it doth not follow from
 “ thence, that there is no salvation without it, or
 “ that a Church cannot consist without it. He is
 “ blind who does not see Churches consisting without
 “ it : he is hard-hearted who denyeth them salvation.
 “ We are none of those hard-hearted persons, we put
 “ a great difference between these things. There
 “ may be something absent in the exterior regiment,
 “ which is of divine right, and yet salvation to be
 “ had.’ This mistake proceedeth, from not distin-
 “ guishing between the true nature and essence of a
 “ Church, which we do readily grant them, and the
 “ integrity or perfection of a Church, which we can-
 “ not grant them, without swerving from the judg-
 “ ment of the Catholic Church.”

Exactly the same line is taken by the mild and
 moderate Bishop Hall, as all know, a tender lover of
 peace, and whose natural prejudices, through his
 education by a Puritan mother, ran the other way ;
 yet these were his matured thoughts. It is well also

to hear the solemn feelings with which he commenced his "Episcopacy by Divine Right." "For me, I am
 "now breathing towards the end of my race, the
 "goal is already in my eyes—I that am now setting
 "foot over the threshold of the house of my age,
 "what aim can I have but the issue of my last
 "account, whereto I am ready to be summoned
 "before the Judge of quick and dead? Setting,
 "therefore, that awful Tribunal, to which we shall
 "shortly be presented, before our eyes, let us reason
 "the case with a modest earnestness." This frame
 of mind of the aged and pious man, who thought
 the defence of Episcopacy, as a "Divine institu-
 "tion," an acceptable employment of his latter days,
 when "the time of his departure was at hand," is
 surely somewhat different from those of the younger
 men now, who adduce anxiety about the Apostolic
 succession as a foremost testimony, that we "pay¹
 "greater attention to the form and vehicle in which
 "the divine mercy is conveyed to us, than to the
 "truth and power of the blessing itself." Bishop Hall
 then proceeds to distinguish between the case of the
 Scottish Bishop, with whom he was expostulating
 for having renounced his Episcopal function, and that
 of the foreign Protestant bodies; "know², their case
 "and your's is far enough different; they plead to be
 "by a kind of necessity cast upon that condition,

¹ Essays on the Church, p. 309, 10.

² Episcopacy by Divine Right, p. i. § 2.

“ which you have willingly chosen ; they were not,
 “ they could not be, what you were, and still
 “ might have been. Did any of them forsake and
 “ abjure that function of Episcopacy, which he might
 “ freely have enjoyed with the full liberty of pro-
 “ fessing the reformed religion ?” It is then on this
 same plea of *necessity*, that Bishop Hall excused the
 German reformers ;—because¹ they were willing to
 “ maintain and establish Episcopal government, de-
 “ siring to restore it, troubled that they might not
 “ continue it : might they have enjoyed the Gospel,
 “ they would have enjoyed Episcopacy ;” “ all the
 “ world sees the Apologist professteth for them, [the
 German reformers,] that they greatly desired to
 “ conserve the government of Bishops, that they were
 “ altogether unwillingly driven from it ; that it was
 “ utterly against their heart, that it should have been
 “ impaired or weakened ; that it was only the per-
 “ sonal cruelty and violence of their Romish perse-
 “ cutors which was then excepted against ;” he excuses
 it, because² “ they took up this equality of govern-
 “ ment only provisionally ;” because “ they meant not
 “ to traverse the state of the Clergy, or to submit it to
 “ their orders, whensoever the Clergy or whole state of
 “ France should happen to admit the Reformation ;”
 because “ they were by the iniquity of their times in
 “ a manner forcibly driven (*at least as they imagined*)

¹ Episcopacy by Divine Right, p. i. § 3.

² *Ib.* § 5.

“ upon this form, and necessarily put to their choice
 “ whether they would still submit to Popery, or no
 “ longer submit to Episcopal Administration, which
 “ there was only managed by Popish hands.” He
 likens the abandonment of Episcopacy in such a case,
 to a “ mariner casting out his goods in a storm,”
 “ cutting off a limb to prevent the deadly malignity
 “ of a gangrene,” “ pulling down the next roof when
 “ an house is on fire in the City ;” and yet though
 he would not take upon himself to judge others, yet
 we see that he himself would have waited, with a
 more constant faith, “ until the tyranny were over-
 past,” rather than throw over with his own hands the
 deposit committed to him. “ Fear not, thou bearest
 “ Cæsar” was thought assurance enough when the
 storm lay vehemently upon his vessel ; much more
 then to us, “ Fear not, thou bearest an Ordinance
 “ of thy Lord’s ; it is thy Lord Himself ‘ asleep in the
 “ hinder part of the ship.’” For in the midst of this
 palliation of their case, Bishop Hall cannot but express
 his own doubts, whether any plea of necessity should
 have been admitted in such a case : “ Though also,”
 he adds, “ it is very considerable, *whether the condition*
 “ *they were in, doth altogether absolutely warrant such a*
 “ *proceeding ;* for was it not so with us, after Reforma-
 “ tion was stept in, during those fiery times of Queen
 “ Mary ? Was it not so with you, when those holy
 “ men, Patrick Hamilton, and George Wischart,
 “ sowed the first seeds of Reformation among you
 “ in their own blood ? With that spirit the Holy

“ Ghost indued them, of patience and constancy
 “ crowned with martyrdom, not of tumult and oppo-
 “ sition, to the disquiet of the state and hazard of the
 “ reformation itself; or to the abjuring and blasphem-
 “ ing of an holy Order in the Church, and dis-
 “ honouring of Almighty God, while they pretended to
 “ seek His honour.” Moreover Bishop Hall only ex-
 cuses, in a degree, those who did this upon necessity,
 as they thought, in order the more strongly to con-
 trast their case with that of those who did the same
 without necessity. “ This was their case; but what
 “ is this to your’s? Your [the Scotch] Church was
 “ happily gone out of Babylon; your and our most
 “ gracious and religious sovereign sincerely professeth,
 “ maintaineth, encourageth, the blessedly-reformed
 “ religion; his Bishops preach for it, write for it, and
 “ profess themselves ready, after the example of their
 “ predecessors, to bleed for it. And how can you
 “ now think of paralleling your condition with the
 “ foreign?” The loss of Episcopacy, when it seemed
 for the time that it could not be had, Bishop Hall
 looks upon with “pity¹,” its voluntary rejection he
 entitles, “to² cast mire in the faces of the blessed
 “ Apostles, who received it from their God and Sa-
 “ viour, and, by the guidance of His Spirit, ordained
 “ it:” those who had abandoned it he “beseeches³
 “ and adjures by that love they profess to bear to
 “ the truth of God, by that tender respect they bear

¹ Epistle dedicatory.

² P. 1. § 1.

³ P. 3. §. 8.

“ to the peace of His Zion, by their zeal to the Gospel,
 “ of Christ, by their main care of their happy account
 “ one day before the tribunal of the most righteous
 “ Judge of the quick and dead ; to lay all this that
 “ he had said, seriously together,” and “ for God’s
 “ sake and his own, not upon groundless suggestion
 “ to abandon God’s truth and ordinance, and adore
 “ an idol made of the ear-rings of the people, and
 “ fashioned out with the graving-tool of a supposed
 “ skilful Aaron;” “and for you,” he adds⁴, “ my
 “ dearly beloved brethren at home, for Christ’s
 “ sake, for the Church’s sake, for your souls’ sake, be
 “ exhorted to hold fast to this holy Institution of
 “ your Blessed Saviour, and his unerring Apostles,
 “ and bless God for Episcopacy.”

So might an aged saint write, when our evils were yet fresh, and our wounds green ; but now that they are thought past healing, it is to be held that they are not wounds, but natural functions of the body. Truth is to be held one thing in England, another across the Tweed. Alas for the change, when “ the “ holy Institution of our Blessed Saviour” is held to be a thing wholly outward, and anxiety for it a sign of formalism !

But the doctrine of the Apostolic succession, rightly put forward, does not protect our people against dissent, or Ultra-Protestantism only ; it is equally a protection against Rome. And hence have

⁴ § 9.

the agents of that Church "sought" many "false witnesses," in order to invalidate our succession and our orders; and when she has "found none" has resorted to so many frivolous pretences. For since there cannot be in the same place two successors of the Apostles, the admission that we have the Apostolical succession, must, on principles which they cannot but acknowledge, altogether exclude them. Hence it has been observed¹, "The objections against the validity of the English ordinations have been almost exclusively devised and employed by the Romanists of England and Ireland; who having revolted from their own Churches, resorted to every imaginable expedient to establish their new community, *per fas et nefas*, on the ruins of the Church of Christ. The churches of the Roman communion were in part deceived by the artifices and falsehoods of these men; but notwithstanding the errors and prejudice which they created, many theologians of that communion were fully persuaded that our ordinations were valid."

Hence also the great displeasure, which was excited by Courayer's writing his able defence of our orders. It was objected to him at the time, "it² interposed an obstacle to the conversion of many English."

The Apostolical succession then is not an abstract argument, but a tangible fact, the value of which

¹ Palmer on the Church, pt. vi. c. 10. t. ii. p. 452.

² Le Quien ap. Palmer, l. c. p. 451.

any plain man can feel. Any one can understand that our LORD promised to be with the Apostles and with their successors to the end of the world; nor do any other even claim to be the successors of the original Bishops of our Church, who were ordained by Apostles or Apostolic men, except those who now fill those sees, the Bishops of the Anglo-Catholic Church. The Romanist Bishops were but of yesterday, nor do they even pretend to be Bishops of our sees; they assume only to be Bishops *in partibus infidelium*; among us they are only the delegates of the Bishop of Rome. And thus they acknowledge themselves schismatics: the Romish communion in this country has, as well as the dissenters, separated itself from those who have received their Commission from the Head of the Church. To quote again the tranquil and learned writer just cited¹. “The Romish party
 “in these countries committed schism in separating
 “from the communion of the Church, and the obedience of their legitimate pastors, in the reign of
 “Elizabeth. It is certain, that during the reigns of
 “Henry VIII. and his successors, until the eleventh
 “year of Queen Elizabeth’s reign, there were not
 “two separate communions and worships in England.
 “All the people were subject to the same pastors,
 “attended the same churches, and received the same
 “sacraments. It was only about 1570 that the
 “Romish party, at the instigation of foreign emissaries, separated itself and fell from the Catholic

¹ Palmer, pt. ii. c. 6. § 11. “The Romish Sect schismatic.”

“ Church of England.”—“ A society formed in this
 “ manner, by voluntary separation from a Church of
 “ Christ, was totally cut’ off from the unity of the
 “ Catholic Church ; nor is it to be alleged in reply,
 “ that the new community was recognized by the
 “ Roman Bishops and some of the Western Churches ;
 “ for this only proves that the Roman Bishops en-
 “ couraged schism, and the other Churches were
 “ misled by their excessive veneration for the Roman
 “ See, and by the misrepresentations of the enemies
 “ of the Church of England ; therefore their sanction
 “ to the new community, being given on erroneous
 “ information, could not afford any justification of it.

“ It is evident then, that the whole separation or
 “ schism was originated and effected by the Roman
 “ pontiffs and their adherents, not by the Churches
 “ among us. I repeat it, as a fact which ought never
 “ to be forgotten, that WE DID NOT GO OUT FROM
 “ THEM, but, as the Apostle says, THEY WENT OUT
 “ FROM US ; thus bearing what is, as Bossuet well
 “ observes, the invariable mark of schism and heresy
 “ in every age : ‘ Non enim nos ab illis, sed illi a
 “ nobis recesserunt.’

“ Hence it follows that the Romish communities
 “ in England are not Churches of Christ ; and we
 “ have an additional proof of this in the fact, that
 “ they were unable to show any succession of the
 “ episcopacy in their conventicles. The Pope indeed
 “ sent a titular bishop to them in 1625, whose suc-
 “ cessor went to France in 1629, and returned no

“ more; and up to the present time the Romish
 “ community has not had any bishops, for although
 “ the vicars apostolic (as they call themselves) pre-
 “ tend to the episcopal character, this character is by
 “ no means essential to their office; their successors
 “ may be priests or monks, and they have no ordi-
 “ nary power over the English Romanists, being
 “ merely deputies of the Roman Pontiff, who may
 “ revoke their commissions, without any trial, at his
 “ own will and pleasure. Consequently as vicars-
 “ apostolic they have no episcopal jurisdiction in
 “ England; and as titular bishops, ‘ *in partibus infi-*
 “ *delium,*’ they have no jurisdiction any where. There-
 “ fore they are not, properly speaking, bishops; and
 “ the Romanists of England are devoid of any apos-
 “ tolical succession of bishops, not to speak of some
 “ serious difficulties which affect the validity of their
 “ orders¹ in these countries, and which will be con-
 “ sidered elsewhere.”

“ The singularity of one pastor in each place de-
 “ scended from the Apostles and their scholars by a
 “ perpetual succession,” to use Bp. Bilson’s words,
 has been uniformly recognized by all Churches in
 the world. The only exception allowed has been
 where the nations speaking different languages are
 united in the same city, in which case each was
 allowed to have the blessing of a Bishop, whose

¹ The consecrations of their earlier Bishops by one Bishop,
 which many among themselves account invalid. Ib. pt. vi.
 c. xi.

language they could understand¹. Otherwise it was a principle acknowledged by the universal Church, and formally ratified by the Council at Nice, that in one place there could be but one Bishop. "One God, One Christ, One Bishop²," was the exclamation of the Roman people, when the Emperor proposed to them to have two Bishops to govern the Church in common. "We are not ignorant," says Cornelius³ to St. Cyprian, that "as there is One God, One Christ the Lord, Whom we have confessed, One Holy Spirit, so there ought to be One Bishop in a Catholic Church." There can be but one representative of the Chief Shepherd in one place. "There⁴ can be one Bishop in a Church at a time and one Judge as Vicegerent of Christ." "Since⁵ there can be no second after the first, who ever is made after him who ought to be alone, is not a second Bishop, but is none." Whence the Martyr St. Cyprian designates such an appointment as "setting⁶ up a profane altar, erecting an adulterous chair, offering sacrilegious sacrifices against the true Priest."

Again then, my Lord, the doctrine of the Apostolic succession, so far from having any connection

¹ This justifies the appointment of an English Bishop in Paris.

² Theodoret, v. 3. quoted by Bingham, ii. 13. 6.

³ Ep. 46. al. 49. quoted ib.

⁴ Cyprian, ep. 55. al. 59. ad Cornel. quoted ib.

⁵ Id. ep. 52. al. 55. ad Antonian. ib.

⁶ Ep. 67. al. 68. ad Steph. ib.

with Romanism, is a bulwark against it. The Romanists account the promises to St. Peter to be confined to their single see; the Anglo-Catholics, with the Primitive Church, that they are inherited by the Bishops universally; Rome has in her corrupt days ever essayed to intrench on the independent authority of Bishops as of Churches; she would have them derive their authority mediately through her existing Bishop, not, together with her Bishop, from the One Bishop. The doctrine of the Apostolic succession involves our independence from the undue authority of Rome. Whatever priority of dignity there may be, the Bishop of the smallest city is as much the representative of the Chief Bishop as the Patriarch of the greatest.

But, besides this, the argument which the Romanists so frequently urge, to take "the safer side," is thus found to be on the side of our own Church. It is indeed the bounden duty of any man, in dubious cases, to take the safer side, *i. e.* that which seems more likely to have the favour of GOD; but the "safer side" is not with those who deny him the "Blood" of CHRIST, "which is shed for many for the remission of sins;" the "safer side" is not with those who forsake those whom He has appointed to succeed His Apostles in this Church, and with whom He has promised to be; the "safest side" is not with those who "form divisions among us," and whom the Apostle has given us this mark "to avoid." The "safest side" is that so feelingly urged by the good Bishop

Hall¹. "Let me therefore confidently shut up all
 " with that resolute word of that blessed Martyr and
 " Saint, Ignatius—'Let all things be done to the
 " honour of God; give respect to your bishop, as
 " you would God should respect you. My soul for
 " their's, who obey their bishop, presbyter, and dea-
 " cons; God grant that my portion may be the same
 " with their's.'" "And let my soul," adds the pious
 Bishop, "have the same share with the blessed
 " Martyr that said so."

No, my Lord! they again little know where our
 Church's "great strength lies," who would have us
 ungratefully give up our Apostolic origin; it is a
 portion of GOD's truth; the birthright which He gave
 us; and whoso is ashamed of any portion of GOD's
 truth, of him will GOD be ashamed; our Church, if
 she profanely despise her birthright, may after-
 wards "find no place for repentance, though she
 "seek it carefully with tears." Rome comes to us
 with high pretensions; true that many of them are
 but "art and man's device," many but the corruptions
 of the truth; seen by the side of the truth, the
 counterfeit will be evident; but if we withdraw the
 truth committed to us, it will pass for gold. There
 is much in the system of Rome to engage imagina-
 tive and ardent minds; and if the corresponding
 truth which we have, is hidden from sight, they will
 embrace it, although painfully feeling the error
 wherewith in that Church it is mingled. We must

¹ Episcopacy by Divine Right, conclusion.

set in array our union with the Ancient Primitive Church against their greater extent of actual Communion; the Catholicity of descent against the Pseudo-Catholicity of usurped and corrupted dominion; the Catholicity of agreement with quod semper, quod ab omnibus, quod ubique traditum est, against the Pseudo-Catholicity of modern corruptions; Apostolic succession against the claim of one universal Episcopacy; our union through continued succession with our Invisible Head, against the union with the one supposed visible head: we must show our people that all which they would seek for in Rome, they may find in the Church wherein they were baptized, if they will but study her character and avail themselves of their privileges; that it be not said of us, when too late, “felices nimium sua si bona norint!” “If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy “day, the things which belong unto thy peace.” Else will they search in the schismatic communion of Rome among us, and think that they will there find, what they had in their own Church and knew it not.

To close this subject in the words of Bishop Stillingfleet¹:—“Three ways, Bishop Sanderson observes, our dissenting brethren, though not intentionally and purposely, yet really and eventually, have been the great promoters of the Roman interest among us; (1) by *putting-to their helping hand to the pulling down of Episcopacy*

¹ Unreasonableness of separation; Pref. quoted Catena, No. 1. Tracts, No. 74. p. 26.

“ (2) by opposing the interest of Rome with more
 “ violence than reason; (3) by frequently mistaking
 “ the question, but especially through the necessity
 “ of some false principle or other, which having once
 “ imbibed, they think themselves bound to maintain,
 “ whatever becomes of the common cause of our
 “ reformation.”

I have now, my Lord, gone through all the subjects expressly treated upon in the “Tracts,” which have been regarded by those of an Ultra-Protestant school, as approximating to Popery; and, I have shown, I trust, that we, together with our Church, hold a distinct and tangible line, removed from modern novelties, whether of Rome or Ultra-Protestantism. In the main outlines, the views which we have put forth as those of our Church, will be familiar to your Lordship, as those of the standard Divines of our Church: we wish to set forth no new doctrines; we would only revive what circumstances connected with the sin of 1688 have thrown into a partial oblivion; we appeal to the formularies of our Church as interpreted by our standard Divines, and agreeing with the best and purest ages. These, as the very titles of our Tracts convey, have been the main topics, upon which we dwelt¹; we wished to

¹ Thus the two first Volumes were divided into (1) Liturgical, (2) on Ordinances, (3) on the Apostolic Succession, (4) on the Doctrine of the Church, (5) on the History of the Church, (6) Records of the Church, to which, in the first, were added some tracts explaining, (7) the Argument for the Church.

put forth no *system* of Divinity; what we wrote were "Tracts for the Times," *i. e.* on such topics as the times seemed to stand in especial need of; they were to fill up the lacunæ of a popular system, to recall to men's minds forgotten or depreciated truths, to invite them to enlarge or correct or modify their systems by the consideration of points upon which they had not hitherto dwelt,—“the Holy Catholic Church,” (our belief of which we daily confess,) and the Ordinances of her LORD, committed to her keeping, whether His Sacraments, or rites, practices, and observances, (such as fasting, Ember days,) which she has ever observed, and which are essential to her well-being; her apostolic succession; her public prayer; her holy days and seasons; or the character of the Liturgy, in which so much of her doctrine is embodied. Occasionally, other topics have been dwelt upon, and defects have been pointed out either in the great rival system of Rome¹, or in the popular way of treating our own². But the great object which runs through the whole was to bring up

¹ No. 27, 28. Bishop Cosin's History of Popish Transubstantiation; 71. on the Controversy with the Romanists; 72. Archbishop Usher's prayers for the dead, not connected with Purgatory; 79. on Purgatory.

² No. 73. "On the Introduction of rationalistic principles into "religion," (against explaining the mysteries of the Faith, through viewing them simply as they operate upon man). No. 80. "On "reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge," (against indiscriminately obtruding religious knowledge on minds unfit to receive it, "casting pearls before swine").

men's practice to the standard of their Church, AS IT IS; to remove ill-founded objections to it¹, to develop to them points, which they had not apparently considered; to realize more the system, in which we actually live, to live up to what we have.

Such was our object; and such topics (as any will have seen who has watched the nature of the attacks upon us,) have been until very lately, the exclusive subjects of censure. The "heresy" of Baptismal regeneration, its supposed connection with the "opus operatum" of Rome, or its variance from their view of justification; the supposed austerity of the repentance insisted on; imagined asceticism, confounded with the penance of the Church of Rome; the uncharitableness of maintaining Apostolic succession or its formality; or the high sense of the mysteriousness and sacredness of the Holy Eucharist; these were the exclusive topics of controversy.

The topics above dwelt upon are parts of the entire Catholic system; none of them stand insulated; they run into each other, and modify our faith or practice; "the Holy Catholic Church," and "the forgiveness of sins," or the "One Baptism for the remission of sins," enter among the few articles of the Creed. It is obvious from the very character of the controversy which was raised, that the mode of man's justification before GOD, the character and

¹ As in No. 13. Principle of selection of Sunday Lessons; 3. on Alterations in the Liturgy; 9. and 43. on Shortening it; 22. on the Athanasian Creed, &c.

importance of the works done by and in him, repentance, future judgment, the mode of man's union with CHRIST, and His indwelling in man; the fruits of the mystery of our Blessed LORD's Incarnation; the Communion of Saints; man's relation to His Redeemer, not as an isolated being, but as a member of "the Church, which is His Body;" the universality of Divine grace: or, to take another class, the character of Schism; the duty of submission or independence of individual Christians; the mode of extending the influence of the Gospel; the duty of receiving articles of faith, without perceiving their bearing upon practice; these and many more are affected by the way in which the subjects thus dwelt upon are determined.

Of late, however, as the conflict has thickened, other ground has been occupied and other weapons been employed; and on these subjects also I must offer some explanation to your Lordship, premising only that these on the contrary were topics, insulated in themselves, and in no case insisted upon, or inculcated by us, but, at most, simply introduced in the course of treating upon other subjects. The two subjects to which I refer are "prayers for God's departed saints," and "celibacy." With the former of these has strangely been united, that of Invocation of the Saints, contrary to the express and careful teaching of the Tracts.

Prayers for those departed in the faith and fear of God.

I have said that this subject was mentioned by us incidentally; I would add, that in whatever degree it has been brought into notice, has been through the diligence of those who blame us, not by ourselves. "Prayers for God's departed saints," as I have already stated more at length, were, in the first instance, simply noticed historically¹, as one of the points, in which all the ancient Liturgies agreed, as also that they did in others, such as "the Kiss of Peace," and the hymn "Therefore with Angels and Archangels," &c. No stress was laid upon the fact; no observation made, except that such prayers had been "excluded from the English ritual;" (others which had just been named having been retained;) the subject of the tract in which this mention of it occurred was wholly different, on the consecration and oblation of the Holy Eucharist: there was no hint of regret at its exclusion; much less any desire of its restoration. It was, apparently, only mentioned, because from the nature of the argument it could not be avoided.

I have said this, my Lord, because I freely confess that I should myself think it inexpedient to bring forward such a topic in public discussion; it is a matter of sacred consolation to those who feel themselves justified in entertaining it; a solemn privilege

¹ Tracts, No. 63.

to the mourner ; but not, after that (in consequence of abuses connected with it in the Romish system,) it had been withdrawn from our Church, to be rashly and indiscriminately revived. Those, who acknowledge it as in itself justified by primitive practice, are content that our Church has placed no restriction upon its private use by her sons ; she has no where blamed it ; though those once in authority in her, withdrew it, (against their earlier judgment, and as matter of practical wisdom only,) from her public services. It must from its very nature be of too solemn a character, and too connected with feelings of sacred sorrow, to be gratuitously brought out of its resting-place, the hearts of those, whose friends are lost out of sight.

An opponent ¹, two years past, to serve a temporary and local purpose, drew it out of the obscurity in which it lay, and, on that occasion, I showed ² that it was neither connected with the doctrine of purgatory, nor new in the later English Church, having been justified, or employed by such Divines, as Bishop Andrews, Bull, Collier, Dean Field, (I might have added, Archbishop Usher, Bishop Taylor, and Barrow,) as well as by a living writer, who could not be accused of any Romanist tendency ; that it was disconnected from Purgatory even by Bucer and

¹ The author of the "Pastoral Epistle from the Pope, to some members of the University of Oxford."

² Earnest Remonstrance to the author of the Pope's Pastoral Letter, &c. p. 18, sqq.

Calvin, when objecting to it, as it stood in our first reformed Liturgy. Since that time, neither in tracts, nor sermons, orally, or in writing, have we any way inculcated it; and the late publicity, which the topic has acquired, has been independent of us. We are aware that our Church does not encourage it; we are satisfied that she does not discourage it; she discourages only such prayers, as the Romanists use, which are connected with the modern doctrine of Purgatory, not those of the Primitive Church, which, as have been shown by Archbishop Usher and others, are opposed to that doctrine.

Here also, my Lord, we would contend that our Church keeps her "via media;" both Romanist and Ultra-Protestant dogmatize about the state of departed souls; the Romanist, following a natural instinct of human nature, decides that almost all souls undergo a painful purification after death, by which "Infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni¹." The Ultra-Protestant, supposing all sins to be absolutely hidden and covered by the imputation of CHRIST's righteousness, decides as peremptorily that the departed saints are already in *full* possession of the joys of heaven; he conceives of them as already "like the angels of God in Heaven;" he speaks of the "joys of Heaven" as already bestowed upon them: consistently with his theory, he leaves out of

¹ Æn. vi. 742.

sight, "judgment to come" as well as the "resurrection of the body." The world, now as in Homer's time, thinks of them as ἀμενηνὰ κάθηνα, compassionates them as inactive, and withdrawn from *their* world, despises or forgets them. Our Church, in contrast to all these, cherishes their memory; blesses GOD for them¹; thinks of them as "resting "in Christ²," and of their "spirits" as "living with "God in joy and felicity²," yet desires "their's and "our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body "and soul, in His eternal and everlasting glory²." She holds "all who depart hence in the Lord," to be "in peace and at rest," and this was held by the Ancient Church also, and, as being inconsistent with Purgatory, is the very point of divergence from Rome³; she regards them as in a state of, as yet, imperfect happiness, and so differs from the Ultra-Protestant; and in both, her view coincides with the prayers of the Ancient Church, which speak of those departed as at rest, yet pray "that God would show them "mercy, and hasten the resurrection, and give a "blessed sentence in the great day." So that although, for the safety of her children, she relinquished the practice, her doctrine is in accordance with it. And certainly, it is of much importance that this should be rightly understood, for as Archbishop Usher observed, "Our Romanists do com-

¹ Prayer for the Church Militant.

² Burial Service.

³ Bishop Taylor, Dissuasive from Popery, c. 1. sect. 4. Archbishop Usher, Answer to a Jesuit, c. 7. § 2. &c. Bishop Bull, Sermon. 3. and Corruptions of the Church of Rome, t. ii. p. 260.

“ monly take it for granted, that purgatory and “ prayer for the dead be so closely linked together, “ that the one doth necessarily imply the other.” It is the wisdom of their controversialists¹ so to bind up the ancient practice with the modern corruption, that they should seem to be really blended together; it is our’s to show them to be distinct; else are we enlisting man’s natural and dutiful veneration for Antiquity on the side of Rome, and ourselves misleading them, and tempting them to abandon us. Those who condemn *all* prayers for CHRIST’S departed servants, as Popish, are doing Rome an honour which she little deserves, and making her out in this respect to be primitive, instead of the corrupter of primitive practice.

In another point of view—if “ to pray for the dead was the dictate of human nature²,” as well as the practice of the Primitive Church—and no one, probably, who has observed himself, will doubt this—it is surely putting the members of our Church in a needlessly disadvantageous position, to teach them that our Church proscribes such prayer, that it is not to be had but in Romanism.

Why narrow thus what our Church has left undefined? why, if when our Church prays that GOD would

¹ In a recent popular book, by Dr. Rock, professing to illustrate the Romanist doctrines from monuments of ancient art, is a chapter on Purgatory; yet there is not an approximation to the doctrine of purgatory in any one inscription cited; nothing beyond the primitive character of prayer for the departed saints.

² Dr. Short’s Hist. of English Church, § 15.

“ give us grace so to follow their good examples, that
 “ *with them*, we may be partakers of His heavenly
 “ kingdom,” any think that she longs for *their* “ final
 “ consummation in bliss” also, should any one seek to
 hinder it? or if any, understanding in a primitive
 sense a primitive prayer, “ most humbly beseeching
 “ Thee to grant that by the merits and Passion of Thy
 “ Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood,
 “ we and *all Thy whole Church* may obtain remission
 “ of our sins, and *all other benefits of His Passion*,”
 should think that those emphatic words, “ *all thy*
 “ *whole Church*,” were not to be restrained to the
 Church militant, but included that portion of the
 Church also, which is at rest, and prayed that they
 also might enjoy such “ benefits of His Passion,” as
 belonged to their state of rest, why should he be
 hindered¹? Surely, both wisdom and charity require
 that we should not narrow our pale, nor proscribe a
 practice of the primitive Church, even though wisdom
 and charity prevent its formal restoration. A formal
 restoration would, in the corrupt state of modern
 manners, probably lower still further the standard of
 holiness; men would probably abuse these prayers
 as a ground of carnal security, and, by a worse cor-
 ruption than that of Rome, look to them as available
 for those *not* “ departed hence in the faith and fear of
 God.” In order to have with impunity all primitive

¹ So again in the Burial Service, “ that we, *with all those* that
 are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name, may have our
 perfect consummation,” &c.

ordinances, we must have also primitive purity and primitive discipline. To restore privileges before we restore strictness of life, were to begin at the wrong end. But our Church, as has recently been in a very elaborate sentence decided ¹, condemns not *such* prayers, and why should we take upon ourselves to pronounce, where she has thought it most becoming to be silent, or restrain the liberty, which she has left unfettered?

Invocation of Saints.

There is however another subject ordinarily connected with this (though in truth not very naturally) upon which our Church has not been silent, "Invocation of the departed saints," and it is not without some amazement, even with continued experience of the carelessness of controversy, that I find it supposed that we have on this point contravened the direct teaching of our Church. I can scarcely adequately represent to your Lordship how much care was taken to prevent any mistakes upon the subject, or how strange the mis-statements which have been made. In brief, they consist in representing us as approving that which was in the Tracts directly condemned. The case was this: on several grounds it was thought useful to translate a portion of the Breviary; such were the following ², "to claim whatever *is good and true* " in those devotions for the Church Catholic in oppo-

¹ The office of the Judge promoted in *Brecks v. Woolfrey*, given fully in the *Brit. Mag.* vol. xv, p. 91.

² Tracts, No. 75. p. 1, 2.

“ sition to the Roman Church, whose only real claim
 “ above other Churches is that of having adopted into
 “ the Service certain additions and novelties, ascer-
 “ tainable to be such in history, as well as being cor-
 “ ruptions doctrinally.” (2) To illustrate our own
 Prayer-book as being taken from it; (3) to suggest
 matter for our *private* devotions; (4) to “ impress a
 “ truer sense of the excellence and profitableness of
 “ the Psalms, than it is the fashion of this age to
 “ entertain;” (5) by showing the corruptions to be of
 a later date, to add one more “ fact, discriminating
 “ and separating off the Roman from the Primitive
 “ Church.” It was observed again that “ these ¹ por-
 “ tions of the Breviary” [the invocations to the Virgin
 and other Saints] “ carry with them their own plain
 “ condemnation in the judgment of an English Christ-
 “ ian; no commendation of the general structure and
 “ matter of the Breviary itself will have any tendency
 “ to reconcile him to them; and it has been the
 “ strong feeling that this is really the case, that has
 “ led the writer of these pages fearlessly and se-
 “ curely to admit the real excellences, and to dwell
 “ upon the antiquity of the Roman ritual. He has
 “ felt, that since the Romanists required an unquali-
 “ fied assent to the *whole* of the Breviary, and that
 “ there were passages, which no Anglican could
 “ ever admit, praise *the true Catholic portion* of it as
 “ much as he might, he did not in the slightest de-

¹ *Ib.* p. 8.

Calvin, when objecting to it, as it stood in our first reformed Liturgy. Since that time, neither in tracts, nor sermons, orally, or in writing, have we any way inculcated it; and the late publicity, which the topic has acquired, has been independent of us. We are aware that our Church does not encourage it; we are satisfied that she does not discourage it; she discourages only such prayers, as the Romanists use, which are connected with the modern doctrine of Purgatory, not those of the Primitive Church, which, as have been shown by Archbishop Usher and others, are opposed to that doctrine.

Here also, my Lord, we would contend that our Church keeps her "via media;" both Romanist and Ultra-Protestant dogmatize about the state of departed souls; the Romanist, following a natural instinct of human nature, decides that almost all souls undergo a painful purification after death, by which "Infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni¹." The Ultra-Protestant, supposing all sins to be absolutely hidden and covered by the imputation of CHRIST'S righteousness, decides as peremptorily that the departed saints are already in *full* possession of the joys of heaven; he conceives of them as already "like the angels of God in Heaven;" he speaks of the "joys of Heaven" as already bestowed upon them: consistently with his theory, he leaves out of

¹ Æn. vi. 742.

sight, "judgment to come" as well as the "resurrection of the body." The world, now as in Homer's time, thinks of them as ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα, compassionates them as inactive, and withdrawn from *their* world, despises or forgets them. Our Church, in contrast to all these, cherishes their memory; blesses GOD for them¹; thinks of them as "resting "in Christ²," and of their "spirits" as "living with "God in joy and felicity²," yet desires "their's and "our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body "and soul, in His eternal and everlasting glory²." She holds "all who depart hence in the Lord," to be "in peace and at rest," and this was held by the Ancient Church also, and, as being inconsistent with Purgatory, is the very point of divergence from Rome³; she regards them as in a state of, as yet, imperfect happiness, and so differs from the Ultra-Protestant; and in both, her view coincides with the prayers of the Ancient Church, which speak of those departed as at rest, yet pray "that God would show them "mercy, and hasten the resurrection, and give a "blessed sentence in the great day." So that although, for the safety of her children, she relinquished the practice, her doctrine is in accordance with it. And certainly, it is of much importance that this should be rightly understood, for as Archbishop Usher observed, "Our Romanists do com-

¹ Prayer for the Church Militant.

² Burial Service.

³ Bishop Taylor, Dissuasive from Popery, c. 1. sect. 4. Archbishop Usher, Answer to a Jesuit, c. 7. § 2. &c. Bishop Bull, Sermon. 3. and Corruptions of the Church of Rome, t. ii. p. 260.

ordinances, we must have also primitive purity and primitive discipline. To restore privileges before we restore strictness of life, were to begin at the wrong end. But our Church, as has recently been in a very elaborate sentence decided¹, condemns not *such* prayers, and why should we take upon ourselves to pronounce, where she has thought it most becoming to be silent, or restrain the liberty, which she has left unfettered?

Invocation of Saints.

There is however another subject ordinarily connected with this (though in truth not very naturally) upon which our Church has not been silent, "Invocation of the departed saints," and it is not without some amazement, even with continued experience of the carelessness of controversy, that I find it supposed that we have on this point contravened the direct teaching of our Church. I can scarcely adequately represent to your Lordship how much care was taken to prevent any mistakes upon the subject, or how strange the mis-statements which have been made. In brief, they consist in representing us as approving that which was in the Tracts directly condemned. The case was this: on several grounds it was thought useful to translate a portion of the Breviary; such were the following², "to claim whatever *is good and true*" "in those devotions for the Church Catholic in oppo-

¹ The office of the Judge promoted in *Brecks v. Woolfrey*, given fully in the *Brit. Mag.* vol. xv. p. 91.

² Tracts, No. 75. p. 1, 2.

“ give us grace so to follow their good examples, that “ *with them*, we may be partakers of His heavenly “ kingdom,” any think that she longs for *their* “ final “ consummation in bliss” also, should any one seek to hinder it? or if any, understanding in a primitive sense a primitive prayer, “ most humbly beseeching “ Thee to grant that by the merits and Passion of Thy “ Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, “ we and *all Thy whole Church* may obtain remission “ of our sins, and *all other benefits of His Passion*,” should think that those emphatic words, “ *all thy “ whole Church*,” were not to be restrained to the Church militant, but included that portion of the Church also, which is at rest, and prayed that they also might enjoy such “ benefits of His Passion,” as belonged to their state of rest, why should he be hindered¹? Surely, both wisdom and charity require that we should not narrow our pale, nor proscribe a practice of the primitive Church, even though wisdom and charity prevent its formal restoration. A formal restoration would, in the corrupt state of modern manners, probably lower still further the standard of holiness; men would probably abuse these prayers as a ground of carnal security, and, by a worse corruption than that of Rome, look to them as available for those *not* “ departed hence in the faith and fear of God.” In order to have with impunity all primitive

¹ So again in the Burial Service, “ that we, *with all those* that are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name, may have our perfect consummation,” &c.

ordinances, we must have also primitive purity and primitive discipline. To restore privileges before we restore strictness of life, were to begin at the wrong end. But our Church, as has recently been in a very elaborate sentence decided¹, condemns not *such* prayers, and why should we take upon ourselves to pronounce, where she has thought it most becoming to be silent, or restrain the liberty, which she has left unfettered?

Invocation of Saints.

There is however another subject ordinarily connected with this (though in truth not very naturally) upon which our Church has not been silent, "Invocation of the departed saints," and it is not without some amazement, even with continued experience of the carelessness of controversy, that I find it supposed that we have on this point contravened the direct teaching of our Church. I can scarcely adequately represent to your Lordship how much care was taken to prevent any mistakes upon the subject, or how strange the mis-statements which have been made. In brief, they consist in representing us as approving that which was in the Tracts directly condemned. The case was this: on several grounds it was thought useful to translate a portion of the Breviary; such were the following², "to claim whatever *is good and true*" "in those devotions for the Church Catholic in oppo-

¹ The office of the Judge promoted in *Brecks v. Woolfrey*, given fully in the *Brit. Mag.* vol. xv. p. 91.

² Tracts, No. 75. p. 1, 2.

“ sition to the Roman Church, whose only real claim
 “ above other Churches is that of having adopted into
 “ the Service certain additions and novelties, ascer-
 “ tainable to be such in history, as well as being cor-
 “ ruptions doctrinally.” (2) To illustrate our own
 Prayer-book as being taken from it; (3) to suggest
 matter for our *private* devotions; (4) to “ impress a
 “ truer sense of the excellence and profitableness of
 “ the Psalms, than it is the fashion of this age to
 “ entertain;” (5) by showing the corruptions to be of
 a later date, to add one more “ fact, discriminating
 “ and separating off the Roman from the Primitive
 “ Church.” It was observed again that “ these ¹ por-
 “ tions of the Breviary” [the invocations to the Virgin
 and other Saints] “ carry with them their own plain
 “ condemnation in the judgment of an English Christ-
 “ ian; no commendation of the general structure and
 “ matter of the Breviary itself will have any tendency
 “ to reconcile him to them; and it has been the
 “ strong feeling that this is really the case, that has
 “ led the writer of these pages fearlessly and se-
 “ curely to admit the real excellences, and to dwell
 “ upon the antiquity of the Roman ritual. He has
 “ felt, that since the Romanists required an unquali-
 “ fied assent to the *whole* of the Breviary, and that
 “ there were passages, which no Anglican could
 “ ever admit, praise *the true Catholic portion* of it as
 “ much as he might, he did not in the slightest de-

¹ *Ib.* p. 8.

"gree approximate to a recommendation of Roman-
 "ism." This however was not all ; for after distin-
 guishing the different parts of these corrupt additions,
 it was said that even those least objectionable, "*now*
 " do but sanction and encourage that direct worship of
 " the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, which is the great
 " practical offence of the Latin Church, and *so are a*
 " *serious evil.*" Then it was pointed out that the oldest
 of these forms were the least objectionable, and were
 of a different kind from those now common in the
 Roman Church ; still though "*more* could be said
 "*towards* their justification than for those other ad-
 "dresses," they "*are now,*" it was said, " a serious evil ;"
 it was not said that they could be *justified*, much less
 were they recommended ; it was only said that *more*
 could be said *towards* it ; but that they were " a se-
 "rious evil." Having, as it would seem, thus guarded
 against all possibility of mistake, the writer of this
 Tract proceeded to translate whole portions of the
 Breviary, as it stands, exhibiting together both the
 true Catholic portion and the Romanist additions,
 but referring back in almost every case to the pages
 of the preface in which these had been thus decidedly
 condemned. Now it will scarcely seem credible, my
 Lord, that the sole foundation for the allegation, that
 we "*advocate* prayers to the saints," are those very
 extracts from the Breviary in which they are so mani-
 foldly condemned ; that because we would " reappro-
 "priate to the Catholic Church, in opposition to the
 " Roman Church," " the true Catholic portion" of the

Breviary, (which the Romanists have never entrusted their people with in their own tongue,) therefore it is asserted that we would reappropriate those very prayers which we distinguish from it; that when we speak of the *least* of these corruptions as a “serious evil,” we would wish to “reappropriate” the *greatest* as a “treasure¹.” But neither is this the whole extent of the misrepresentation, for in another Tract in the same volume, to which the attention could not but be called, as it was expressly “on the

¹ “The 75th number of the Tracts for the Times is composed “of selections from the Romish Breviary, prepared and recommended for Protestant use; in the preface to which the editor “says, ‘our adversaries have in this, as in many other instances, “appropriated to themselves a treasure’ [viz. ‘the true Catholic portion,’ see above, p. 193] which was our’s as much as their’s. The “publication then of these selections is, as it were, an act of re-“appropriation.’ And among these prayers thus reappropriated to “Protestant use, we find the following,” [whereon follows one of the class, p. 61. which had been *expressly* designated as “a serious evil” and two others, which fell under the same class.] “Prayers for “the dead, and prayers to the Saints are both advocated” [whereon follows a hymn, of which it is yet noted in the very margin, “It is “remarkable, that this hymn, which is the only one of those here “translated, which *savours of Romanism*, is the only one, except “one other, which is not known to be ancient;” so that the translator again remarks the coincidence of Romish corruption and absence of proof of antiquity,] Essays, p. 289. Another writer says, “*the whole* is declared in the preface, to be a ‘reappropriation of a “treasure, which had long been lost.’” Fraser, p. 23; and yet this same writer in the next page refers to the Tract in which “invocation of the saints” is mentioned among the “chief points to be “urged in controversy with Rome.”

Calvin, when objecting to it, as it stood in our first reformed Liturgy. Since that time, neither in tracts, nor sermons, orally, or in writing, have we any way inculcated it; and the late publicity, which the topic has acquired, has been independent of us. We are aware that our Church does not encourage it; we are satisfied that she does not discourage it; she discourages only such prayers, as the Romanists use, which are connected with the modern doctrine of Purgatory, not those of the Primitive Church, which, as have been shown by Archbishop Usher and others, are opposed to that doctrine.

Here also, my Lord, we would contend that our Church keeps her "via media;" both Romanist and Ultra-Protestant dogmatize about the state of departed souls; the Romanist, following a natural instinct of human nature, decides that almost all souls undergo a painful purification after death, by which "Infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni¹." The Ultra-Protestant, supposing all sins to be absolutely hidden and covered by the imputation of CHRIST'S righteousness, decides as peremptorily that the departed saints are already in *full* possession of the joys of heaven; he conceives of them as already "like the angels of God in Heaven;" he speaks of the "joys of Heaven" as already bestowed upon them: consistently with his theory, he leaves out of

¹ Æn. vi. 742.

sight, "judgment to come" as well as the "resurrection of the body." The world, now as in Homer's time, thinks of them as ἀμενηνὰ κάθηνα, compassionates them as inactive, and withdrawn from *their* world, despises or forgets them. Our Church, in contrast to all these, cherishes their memory; blesses God for them¹; thinks of them as "resting "in Christ²," and of their "spirits" as "living with "God in joy and felicity²," yet desires "their's and "our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body "and soul, in His eternal and everlasting glory²." She holds "all who depart hence in the Lord," to be "in peace and at rest," and this was held by the Ancient Church also, and, as being inconsistent with Purgatory, is the very point of divergence from Rome³; she regards them as in a state of, as yet, imperfect happiness, and so differs from the Ultra-Protestant; and in both, her view coincides with the prayers of the Ancient Church, which speak of those departed as at rest, yet pray "that God would show them "mercy, and hasten the resurrection, and give a "blessed sentence in the great day." So that although, for the safety of her children, she relinquished the practice, her doctrine is in accordance with it. And certainly, it is of much importance that this should be rightly understood, for as Archbishop Usher observed, "Our Romanists do com-

¹ Prayer for the Church Militant.

² Burial Service.

³ Bishop Taylor, Dissuasive from Popery, c. 1. sect. 4. Archbishop Usher, Answer to a Jesuit, c. 7. § 2. &c. Bishop Bull, Sermon. 3. and Corruptions of the Church of Rome, t. ii. p. 260.

“monly take it for granted, that purgatory and “prayer for the dead be so closely linked together, “that the one doth necessarily imply the other.” It is the wisdom of their controversialists¹ so to bind up the ancient practice with the modern corruption, that they should seem to be really blended together; it is our’s to show them to be distinct; else are we enlisting man’s natural and dutiful veneration for Antiquity on the side of Rome, and ourselves misleading them, and tempting them to abandon us. Those who condemn *all* prayers for CHRIST’s departed servants, as Popish, are doing Rome an honour which she little deserves, and making her out in this respect to be primitive, instead of the corrupter of primitive practice.

In another point of view—if “to pray for the dead was the dictate of human nature²,” as well as the practice of the Primitive Church—and no one, probably, who has observed himself, will doubt this—it is surely putting the members of our Church in a needlessly disadvantageous position, to teach them that our Church proscribes such prayer, that it is not to be had but in Romanism.

Why narrow thus what our Church has left undefined? why, if when our Church prays that GOD would

¹ In a recent popular book, by Dr. Rock, professing to illustrate the Romanist doctrines from monuments of ancient art, is a chapter on Purgatory; yet there is not an approximation to the doctrine of purgatory in any one inscription cited; nothing beyond the primitive character of prayer for the departed saints.

² Dr. Short’s Hist. of English Church, § 15.

“ give us grace so to follow their good examples, that “ *with them*, we may be partakers of His heavenly “ kingdom,” any think that she longs for *their* “ final “ consummation in bliss” also, should any one seek to hinder it? or if any, understanding in a primitive sense a primitive prayer, “ most humbly beseeching “ Thee to grant that by the merits and Passion of Thy “ Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, “ we and *all Thy whole Church* may obtain remission “ of our sins, and *all other benefits of His Passion,*” should think that those emphatic words, “ *all thy “ whole Church,*” were not to be restrained to the Church militant, but included that portion of the Church also, which is at rest, and prayed that they also might enjoy such “ benefits of His Passion,” as belonged to their state of rest, why should he be hindered¹? Surely, both wisdom and charity require that we should not narrow our pale, nor proscribe a practice of the primitive Church, even though wisdom and charity prevent its formal restoration. A formal restoration would, in the corrupt state of modern manners, probably lower still further the standard of holiness; men would probably abuse these prayers as a ground of carnal security, and, by a worse corruption than that of Rome, look to them as available for those *not* “ departed hence in the faith and fear of God.” In order to have with impunity all primitive

¹ So again in the Burial Service, “ that we, *with all those* that are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name, may have our perfect consummation,” &c.

ordinances, we must have also primitive purity and primitive discipline. To restore privileges before we restore strictness of life, were to begin at the wrong end. But our Church, as has recently been in a very elaborate sentence decided ¹, condemns not *such* prayers, and why should we take upon ourselves to pronounce, where she has thought it most becoming to be silent, or restrain the liberty, which she has left unfettered?

Invocation of Saints.

There is however another subject ordinarily connected with this (though in truth not very naturally) upon which our Church has not been silent, "Invocation of the departed saints," and it is not without some amazement, even with continued experience of the carelessness of controversy, that I find it supposed that we have on this point contravened the direct teaching of our Church. I can scarcely adequately represent to your Lordship how much care was taken to prevent any mistakes upon the subject, or how strange the mis-statements which have been made. In brief, they consist in representing us as approving that which was in the Tracts directly condemned. The case was this: on several grounds it was thought useful to translate a portion of the Breviary; such were the following ², "to claim whatever *is good and true*" "in those devotions for the Church Catholic in oppo-

¹ The office of the Judge promoted in *Brecks v. Woolfrey*, given fully in the *Brit. Mag.* vol. xv. p. 91.

² Tracts, No. 75. p. 1, 2.

“sition to the Roman Church, whose only real claim
 “above other Churches is that of having adopted into
 “the Service certain additions and novelties, ascer-
 “tainable to be such in history, as well as being cor-
 “ruptions doctrinally.” (2) To illustrate our own
 Prayer-book as being taken from it; (3) to suggest
 matter for our *private* devotions; (4) to “impress a
 “truer sense of the excellence and profitableness of
 “the Psalms, than it is the fashion of this age to
 “entertain;” (5) by showing the corruptions to be of
 a later date, to add one more “fact, discriminating
 “and separating off the Roman from the Primitive
 “Church.” It was observed again that “these ¹ por-
 “tions of the Breviary” [the invocations to the Virgin
 and other Saints] “carry with them their own plain
 “condemnation in the judgment of an English Christ-
 “ian; no commendation of the general structure and
 “matter of the Breviary itself will have any tendency
 “to reconcile him to them; and it has been the
 “strong feeling that this is really the case, that has
 “led the writer of these pages fearlessly and se-
 “curely to admit the real excellences, and to dwell
 “upon the antiquity of the Roman ritual. He has
 “felt, that since the Romanists required an unquali-
 “fied assent to the *whole* of the Breviary, and that
 “there were passages, which no Anglican could
 “ever admit, praise *the true Catholic portion* of it as
 “much as he might, he did not in the slightest de-

¹ *Ib.* p. 8.

ception, but a real difference of habit of mind and feeling between the three views. Romanist and Ultra-Protestant are alike rigorous in opposite ways. The Romanist is not content with the persuasion that Christ's departed servants, being admitted near the Presence, and under the shadow of the throne of glory, and by the heavenly Altar¹, continue the intercessions for the Church here below, which they offered while in the body; he will not rest satisfied in the assurance of God's good will to us herein; he must fain obtain to himself a personal interest in their intercessions, appropriate them to himself, make them personally his friends, and so he steps beyond Antiquity, and asks them directly to intercede for him, prays to them, makes them his Intercessors, approaches to GOD and CHRIST through them, instead of casting himself directly upon GOD's mercy in CHRIST; at last, in practice, substitutes them as Intercessors, for the One Intercessor. He begins by laying down that it is "good² and useful *suppliantly* "to invoke them, and to flee to their prayers, aid, and help to obtain benefits from God through His Son "Jesus Christ our Lord, Who Alone is our Redeemer and Saviour," and condemns as "*impious*, those who deny that they are to be invoked, or assert that the invocation of them to pray for each of us *individually*, is idolatry;" he ends by making them his

¹ Rev. vi. 9.

² Conc. Trid. Sess. 25. de invocat. venerat. et reliquiis Sanctorum et sacris imaginibus.

mediators, as beings more like himself, whom he can approach with less of awe, with less earnest resolutions of holiness, less anxiety about his sins, in his own words, as “meek and mild¹,” and not as a “consuming fire.” The Ultra-Protestant, revolted at this abuse, will not hear of their interceding at all, proscribes all thought of it, cuts himself off—not from their communion and fellowship, but from all sense of it and its blessedness; will be thankful for the prayers of weak sinners like himself, but will not feel the privilege of their prayers who are “delivered from the burden of the flesh, and the miseries of this sinful world,” and in the abodes of love, love us more holily; is jealous of every mention of them, and so forgets them; and either restrains the doctrine of the “Communion of Saints” to the charities of this life, or makes it a mere abstract statement that all the redeemed belong to one body. Our Church, between

¹ “Only we shall recite a few words of Antoninus, their great Divine and Archbishop of Florence; ‘it is necessary that they, to whom she converts her eyes, being an advocate for them, shall be justified and saved.’ And whereas it may be objected out of John that the Apostle says, ‘If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous,’ he answers ‘that Christ is not our Advocate alone but our Judge; and since the just is scarce secure, how shall a sinner go to Him as to an Advocate? Therefore God hath provided us an advocatess, who is gentle and sweet, in whom nothing that is sharp is to be found.’” Bp. Taylor, *Dissuasive from Popery*, c. 2. sect. 8; compare Mr. Froude’s observations founded on their actual practice, *Remains*, t. i. p. 294. quoted Appendix, No. 91.

both, recognizes with the ancient Church, the actualness of the Communion of Saints ; that " God ¹ has knit " together His elect in one communion and fellowship, " in the mystical body of His Son, Christ our Lord ;" it rejoices in God's assurance ², that through " the due receiving of the holy mysteries," " we are very members incorporate in the *mystical* body of His Son, " which is the blessed company of all faithful people," and prays, that we may " continue in that holy fellowship ;" weekly " blesses ³ His Holy Name for all His " servants departed this life in His faith and fear ;" accompanies their departure from this life, with " hearty ⁴ thanks that it hath pleased Him to deliver " them out of the miseries of this sinful world ;" prays GOD that His " holy Angels ⁵ may, by His appointment, succour and defend us on earth ;" but there stops short, is content to feel the blessedness of that mystical union, and with the assurance that it must be a blessing, without intruding into that holy fellowship with selfish and unauthorized prayers to them to intercede for us individually, or approaching them with language which if they hear it, must be shocking to them, as belonging rather to their Lord.

We may then have a vivid and thankful sense of our privilege of belonging to a body, part of whom

¹ Collect for All Saints' Day.

² Thanksgiving after Communion.

³ Prayer for the Church Militant.

⁴ Burial Service.

⁵ Collect for St. Michael's and All Angels.

have passed through our trials, tribulations, and infirmities, and “have been brought out of great tribulation and washed their robes in the Blood of the “Lamb;” we may take comfort that they, together with their Lord, sympathise with the imperfect members of His body, and intercede for us before Him, with greater purity than our earthly friends, we might think of it with respectful affection and gratitude; we might thank GOD for it; we might even pray Him, that they might intercede as for us, without even approximating to the errors of the Church of Rome. In a word, we might be thankful that they do intercede for us, without making them our intercessors or praying them so to do. In Origen’s beautiful language¹, “Nor doth the High Priest alone pray “with those who pray truly, but the ‘angels’ also ‘in “heaven’ who ‘rejoice over one sinner that repenteth “more than over ninety and nine just persons, who “need no repentance,’ and the souls of the saints who “fell asleep before us :—For whereas in this life “knowledge is manifested to those accounted worthy, “‘through a glass, darkly,’ but then revealed ‘face to “face,’ it were inconsistent if the like were not “to be the case as to other excellencies, especially “since what is laid up beforehand in this life is then “really perfected. But one of the chiefest excellencies, according to the divine word, is love of our “neighbour, which the saints, who have fallen asleep “before us, must necessarily be supposed to have

¹ De Orat. § 11. t. i. p. 213, 14. ed. de la Rue.

“ much more exceedingly towards those who are yet
 “ engaged in the strife of this life, than those who are
 “ yet beset with human infirmity, and but helping the
 “ weaker in a common strife. Not here alone does bro-
 “ therly love fulfil that saying, ‘if one member suffer,
 “ all the members suffer with it, and if one member
 “ be honoured, all the members rejoice with it.’
 “ For it beseemeth well the love of those who have
 “ departed this present life, to say ‘the care of all
 “ the Churches;—who is weak, and I am not weak?
 “ who is offended, and I burn not?’ and the more,
 “ when Christ professeth that He is sick in each of
 “ the sick saints; and in like way, that He is in
 “ prison also, and naked, and both a stranger and
 “ hungered and a-thirst; for who of those who read
 “ the Gospel knoweth not that Christ, ascribing to
 “ Himself the things which befall believers, account-
 “ eth them as His own sufferings? And if the angels
 “ of God, coming to Jesus, ministered to Him, and it
 “ were not fitting to conceive of this ministry of the
 “ angels about Jesus, as restricted to the brief period
 “ of His bodily sojourn among men, when He was
 “ among believers, ‘not as he that sitteth at meat,
 “ but as he that serveth,’ how many angels, think
 “ you, minister to Jesus, Who willet to bring toge-
 “ ther the children of Israel one by one, and collect
 “ them from the dispersion, and saveth those who fear
 “ and call upon Him!—for not in vain do ‘the angels
 “ of God ascend and descend upon the Son of man,’
 “ being seen by the eyes enlightened by the light of

“ true knowledge ; yea, the angel of each, even of
 “ the ‘ little ones’ in the Church, ‘ always beholding
 “ the face of the Father Who is in heaven,’ and con-
 “ templating the Divinity of Him Who created us,
 “ prayeth together with us, and worketh together in
 “ such things which we pray for, as admit thereof.”

I have dwelt upon this topic, because some of the *more* ancient forms which have been objected to, *may* express nothing more than this consciousness, that the saints at rest do pray for us, and so help us by their prayers. The words “ *intercedentibus omnibus sanctis,*” *need* mean no more than this ; nor *need* the words “ whose ¹ deeds of grace working together with “ our prayers,” mean more than St. Paul means, when he says ², “ I fill up that which is behind of “ the afflictions of Christ in my flesh, for His body’s “ sake which is the Church.” Practically, what was said more than excluded the use of any of these forms ; they were spoken of as, practically, “ a serious “ evil ;” yet it is wise, as well as charitable, not to interpret what *may* be innocent, by later usages which are not so, nor to do Rome the service of carrying up her corruptions into ages which knew not of them, by putting the same glosses upon their words which she would. The liability of their being misunderstood should preclude our using them ; yet ought we not ourselves to misunderstand or misinterpret them.

¹ Essays, p. 289.

² Col. i. 24.

Celibacy.

There yet remains one specific charge, which is to prove an inclination towards the Romanist system, the praise of celibacy. It is urged as an objection, that we do not put forward "the celibacy of the clergy" among "the chief grounds of difference between ourselves and the Church of Rome," and that "Monasticism and celibacy are counselled and recommended in some passages." At the same time it is admitted that these passages cannot be altogether adduced as speaking our sentiments, inasmuch as "several of" us "are married clergymen¹."

And, first, I may state to your Lordship, that nowhere in the Tracts have there been put forth any recommendations whether of celibacy in general, or that of the Clergy in particular. It has not been inculcated, nor even been named in the Tracts; and what has been elsewhere said by any who have written in the Tracts, has been dropped incidentally; there has been nothing of systematic promotion of this state. Then, also, when mentioned, it has been with reference to specific cases, to provide for especial needs², such as where St. Paul says "on account of

¹ Essays, p. 291, 2.

² The passages quoted are Brit. Mag. vol. ix. p. 366. "You must have dissent or monachism in a Christian country: so make your choice." Ib. p. 368. "Great towns will never be evangelized merely by the parochial system; they are beyond the sphere of the parish priest, burdened as he is with the endearments and anxieties of a family." Froude's Remains, t. i. p. 322. "It has

the present distress ;” or as a way more excellent in itself, as one of the triumphs of Faith, not as being generally expedient or desirable, even among the clergy. And herein, at once a distinction is made between the teaching of these writers and that of the Church of Rome, which absolutely requires it of her priests, and it appears also how far they are from advocating views in a proselytizing, or party spirit.

With regard to the subject itself, I may perhaps, the less scruple to speak, as belonging to that class, who, it is admitted, from the circumstances of their own life, cannot be disposed either to disparage marriage, or unduly to exalt the celibate. I own then, my Lord, I cannot read such passages, as, “ There
 “ be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs
 “ for the kingdom of heaven’s sake ; he that is able
 “ to receive it, let him receive it.” “ Verily, I say unto
 “ you that there is no man who hath left father or
 “ mother, or wife or children for My Name’s sake,
 “ but he shall receive manifold more in this present
 “ life, and in the world to come life everlasting.” “ He
 “ that standeth steadfast in his heart, having no ne-

“ lately come into my head that the *present state* of things in En-
 “ gland makes an opening for reviving the monastic system.” He
 continued ; “ I think of putting the view forward under the title
 “ of ‘ Project for reviving religion in great towns.’ Certainly,
 “ colleges of unmarried priests, (who *might* of course *retire to a*
 “ *living, when they could, and liked*) would be the cheapest possi-
 “ ble way of *providing for the spiritual* wants of a large popula-
 “ tion.”

“cessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath
“so decreed in his heart, that he will keep his virgin
“doeth well; so then he that giveth her in marriage
“doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage
“doeth better.”—I cannot read these and others
without acknowledging, that, though marriage is not
permitted only, but “honourable,” yea, our Lord
honoured the marriage rite by His Presence and by
His beginning of miracles, and has consecrated it into
a mystery, and an image of the Church’s union with
Him, still “a more excellent way” is pointed out to
“those, to whom it is given.” Marriage has not only
safety, but honour. Changed as its character is by the
fall, in that it now gives birth to a tainted offspring,
yet, that men might not despise it, and thence make
a snare to themselves, GOD has restored it to a
portion of the dignity, which it had from His institu-
tion in Paradise, dignified it in the Patriarchs, set
forth an example of it in “Abraham His friend,” and
in the pure blessings of Isaac, made its mutual love
a similitude of that which He bears to His Church,
and of her reverence to Him, her Head and Saviour;
hallowed it yet more, in that His Son was born of
the seed of David, according to the flesh, though not
after the flesh, and His Ever-Virgin Mother was be-
trothed, when He “abhorred not the Virgin’s womb,”
and He appointed that mothers should be “saved by
“the Childbearing;” He takes us by the hand, and
hallows our union by the blessing of His Church; so
that what man might have feared to approach, is,

when “enterprised reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly and in the fear of God,” a continual image and representation of things holy and Divine.

But it is the very character of the Faith, that, while it ennobles the use of GOD’s permitted blessing, it points out to those who can receive it, a higher way, by foregoing them. Thus, it declares “every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving,” and it consecrates it to our use, “by the word of God and by Prayer,” yet it shows “a more excellent way” by fasting, which “He who seeth in secret, shall reward openly:” it teaches that “our lands are in our own power,” yet it promises “manifold more to those who forsake houses and lands for His Name’s sake and the Gospel’s:” it teaches to “lie down in peace and sleep in Him, Who maketh us to dwell in safety,” yet those who are able, it invites to be like their Lord, and “watch unto prayer,” to “prevent the night watches,” or even to “spend the night in prayer to God:” it teaches to “use this world without abusing it,” yet is St. Paul’s example higher, who lived “crucified with his Saviour to the world and the world to him:” it sheds a grace and beauty around life’s innocent enjoyments, and teaches us a Christian mirthfulness, yet it points as the higher and nobler to “take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in *necessities*, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ’s sake¹,”

¹ 2 Cor. xii. 10.

in St. Paul's eight-fold "perils;" "in weariness and "painfulness, in hunger and thirst, in cold and nakedness¹," it invests with a sacred awe "magistrates and "those who are in authority," yet bids those "who "would be chief among" us, "to be as the servants "of all;" it sanctifies marriage, but it places above it those who forego wives, for His sake.

But what has this, my Lord, in common with Rome and Romanism? The preference of celibacy, as the higher state, is Scriptural, and as being such, is Primitive. The corruption of Rome was not its *preference*, but its tyrannical and ensnaring and avaricious *enforcement*; it was in forcing (in the middle ages) the Clergy to separate from their wives, and, against the law of GOD, "putting those asunder, whom GOD had "joined;" and this for her own aggrandizement, to make the Clergy more dependant upon herself; it was in conniving with the pride of parents, and entangling the reluctant daughters of the great with vows of celibacy, in order to obtain their dowry for her convents; it is in enforcing a rigid rule of singleness upon all her clergy, and drawing them into it before they know their own strength or weakness; it is in preferring the risk of their salvation to the risk of her own power, and casting them ruthlessly into temptation, without regard to the weak, rather than abandon a rule, which binds them all, though with an iron band, to herself. And thus that corrupt Church

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 26, 27.

has, in the minds of the undistinguishing, cast a reproach over that which Scripture points out as the more excellent, and tainted it with her pride, and avarice, and lust of power.

But why should men thus in their haste leap over to the contrary side, and exercise a tyranny over men's consciences in the opposite way? Why thus decry and revile as Popish what is Primitive? Why should not celibacy be used by those to whom it is given, to bind men's affections the more firmly to their LORD, instead of to Rome? Scripture says¹, "He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong unto the Lord, how he may please the Lord; but he that is married careth for the things of the world, how he may please his wife." Why then cut off the aspirings of those more ardent minds, who hope thus to wait upon their LORD without distraction? Why not be thankful for our own blessings, without grudging to those who have foregone them for their LORD's sake, the blessing annexed to self-denial, that they might "give themselves," the rather, "wholly to these things," and to the service of their Lord? Why not content ourselves to be among those who have

" Love's supporting force
To cheat the toil and cheer the way ;"

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 32, 33.

without envying others

“ in their lonely course,
(Lonely not forlorn¹.)”—

Why, as Rome has tried, and in vain, to stretch out the limbs of her clergy to one uniform standard, should people among us, use the other half of the ancient tyrant's cruelty, and setting up a lower standard, amputate all, which exceeds it? This forced mediocrity of attainment is unsafe as it is cruel; it provides no vent for those, who can find no rest in the ordinary and even-paths of life; it drives such into Romanism, or makes them founders of fresh schisms among ourselves. A more generous course, which would have interposed, when necessary, the guidance of authority, and led but not inhibited, might have made Wesley and Whitfield useful members of the Church, instead of leaving them to plunge thousands into schism, and to train off into a delusive doctrine many of the best members of our Church. I am not advocating celibacy, my Lord, as the general rule of the Church, nor imposing upon others “ a yoke, which I touch not with one of my fingers:” nor have any of us so done. But surely there is room for all; and while the peaceful duties of the country-pastor, can often be even better discharged, perhaps, by a married priest, “ ruling² well his own house,

¹ Christian Year, Feast of St. John the Evangelist.

² Marriage Service.

“ and having his children in subjection in all gravity,” a pattern of domestic charities, there are surely duties enough in the Church, where celibacy may have its proper place¹, and where there is much room for the exhibition of the sterner grace of self-denial, foregoing all the highest earthly joys, which cheer us on our pilgrimage, passing alone and isolated through the world, and *visibly* living only for his Master’s work, and to gather in his Master’s scattered sheep. If the degraded population of many of our great towns are to be recovered from the state of Heathenism in which they are sunk, it must be by such preaching of the cross, wherein it shall be forced upon man’s dull senses, that they who preach it have forsaken all, to take it up, and bear it after their LORD. They must, like St. Paul, “ bear about in “ their bodies the marks of the Lord Jesus,” the prints of His nails, and the piercing of His side. The preacher of repentance did not go forth “ in soft “ clothing,” or “ living delicately,” or encompassed with the joys of life, and if we, as we much need, are to have men “ in the spirit and power of Elias, before “ the great and terrible day of the Lord,” the very circumstances of their lives must correspond with, and declare the earnestness of their message, and that they have left all to bear it. There is need and room for soldiers of all sorts in the Lord’s “ willing “ army ;” why cut off any one kind? why require that

¹ 1 Tim. iii. 4.

all His warriors should "cumber themselves with the concerns of this life?" why should not some undertake a harder, so that it be, which in the Church of Rome it is not, a "willing service?" Why again should the daughters of our land be in a manner forced into marriage, as in the former days of Romanism they were into celibacy, and the days of the Old Testament be brought back upon us, and our ministers marry, in order to "take away their reproach among men," now that He who was looked for is come, and they can serve Him, not by becoming mothers of the holy line whereof He was born, but by ministering to His members in a sanctified Virgin-estate? Why should we not also, instead of our desultory visiting-Societies, have our *Sœurs de la Charité*, whose spotless and religious purity might be their passport amid the scenes of misery and loathsomeness, carrying that awe about them, which even sin feels towards undefiledness, and impressing a healthful sense of shame upon guilt by their very presence? Why should marriage alone have its duties among the daughters of our great, and the single estate be condemned to an unwilling listlessness, or, left to seek undirected, and unauthorized, and unsanctified, ways of usefulness of its own.

Here, also, again, our Church, my Lord, preserves her equable moderation, not enforcing celibacy with the Romanist, nor despising it, with the world, nor dishonouring it, with the Ultra-Protestant, as having no

acceptableness nor excellency, but holding it forth as the result of a "gift" of GOD, to be observed and retained by those upon whom He has bestowed it, as being His gift, but not, of necessity, to be imposed upon or required of any. Only in this, as in other actions of life, she would not have us act, as altogether our own masters, but as having to give account of the gifts which we have received; she does not recommend her Clergy to marry, but only holds it "*lawful*" for them "as for all other Christian men;" nor regards it as a matter of course, (as is the case now-a-days) but as a matter of earnest consideration; to be done or abstained from "at their own discretion, "*as they shall judge the same to seem better to godliness* ¹."

Such, my Lord, are all the topics, which an anxious, though not, I must think, an enlightened, jealousy for the purity of our Church has collected together, whereon to found its warning against what it, from its point of view, must consider as an approximation to Romanism. There has indeed been not a little carelessness in these charges even among those who appear to have taken most pains ², partly from a natural inability to understand a system, which was new to them, partly from an impatience not unnatural, at being disturbed in the quiet possession of one, which had become extensively popular, which they had accustomed themselves to consider as a

¹ Art xxxii.

² Essays on the Church.

proof of the greater spirituality and enlightenment of the present age, and to contrast with the darkness of early times. They had, too, been wont to declaim in a popular way against Popery, without giving themselves much pains to understand its true character, or whether their own ground were tenable against it; their disappointment at the abandonment of any such positions is much the same as was felt by the Romanists at Courayer's defence of our orders; it takes out of their hands a convenient weapon, and they feel that they must look out for another, or at least their grasp of this seems less secure than before. Then, also, they do not understand the relation which our Church really holds to that of Rome; there seems to lurk at the bottom some suspicion that we set up a new Church at the Reformation, instead of merely purifying our ancient one; that we separated ourselves from Rome, instead of simply denying the undue authority of her bishop over us; that we "went out from" her, and are responsible for so doing, that we must have reasons, to show why we do not return to her. Not holding the doctrine of the Apostolical succession, they do not realize to themselves our position as an independent Church, that even independently of the question of our relative purity, we have no more occasion to go over to them than they to us; that individuals among us are bound to remain in the Church, through whose ministry they have been made members of CHRIST. They have not been accustomed to apply the argument to dissent, much

less can they to Romanism, which comes with so much more of system; nay they have in many cases disabled themselves from so doing by acting on a contrary principle towards other Churches; they have not been taught that affectionateness to their own Mother, which should instinctively hold them by her side; they have not learned to regard their Bishops as the representatives of the Apostles, and to cleave to them as the centres of unity; and so they must needs have some strong, hard arguments to satisfy themselves. Any diminution of these unsettles them, as having built no solid foundation, except a general and sometimes exaggerated notion of the corruptions which she has actually and formally sanctioned. Hence one who cannot see that Rome is *the* Antichrist, seems to them to betray them into its hands.

And not only so, but even the very selection of certain topics for our controversy with Rome, has been thought to involve the abandonment of the rest. It so happened that the same writer, in two distinct places recommended to take practical grounds, leaving abstract arguments, or subjects which (as Transubstantiation) cannot be discussed without pain. Two independent opponents fell in, the one with the one essay in which seven such subjects were named, the other, writing against the Tracts, had not read this Tract, though expressly "on the controversy with Rome;" but one in which four only were selected for illustration; both, however, came to the same conclusion, that because only four or seven

happened to be put forward, therefore on all other points we hold with Rome. The argument certainly proves too much, unless seven and four are the same; and it is somewhat characteristic of this hasty proceeding, that one of the tracts¹ of the first year took up the same *fourteen* points upon which Bishop Hall insists in "The Old Religion," as "*some* of our "*irreconcilable* differences with Rome as she is," and having so done, adds, "I might add other points in " which also I protest against the Church of Rome, " but I think it enough to make my confession in " Hall's order, and so leave it."

On the same ground, any concession that Rome is a true Church, is to them equivalent to saying that we should return under her shadow, forgetting what Bishop Hall states as the common sentiment of Divines, though in his days also it brought much declamation against him from Ultra-Protestants. " That which Rome holds with us, makes it a Church: " That which it obtrudes upon us, makes it heretical; " The truth of principles makes it one, the error, and " impiety, of additions makes it irreconcilable, &c. " Look on the face therefore of the Roman Church, " she is ours, she is God's. Look on her back, she " is quite contrary, Antichristian: More plainly, " Rome doth both hold the foundation, and destroy " it; she holds it directly, destroys it by consequent; " In that she holds it she is a true Church, howsoever

¹ No. 38. p. 11. The passage is given in the Appendix, No. 14.

“ impured ; In that she destroys it, (what semblance
 “ soever she makes) she is a Church of malignants.
 “ If she did not altogether hold it, she should be
 “ either no Church, or devilish, but now that she
 “ professes to hold those things directly which by
 “ inferences she closely overthrows, she is a truly
 “ visible Church, but an unsound one ¹.”

When the time of trial shall come, it will be seen which principles most favour Rome, the Catholic or the Ultra-Protestant ². We have seen those in our own Church, who having held extreme Ultra-Protestant notions, have become converts to Rome, of whom she has much boasted. “ Excuse me,” says Archbishop Bramhall ³, “ for telling the truth plainly, many “ who have had their education among Sectaries and “ Non-conformists have apostated to Rome, but few “ or no right Episcopal Divines. *Hot water freezeth “ the soonest.*” “ Unthinking people,” says Bishop Sanderson ⁴, . . . “ are carried away with mere noise and “ pretences, and hope these will secure them against “ the fears of Popery, who talk with most passion,

¹ Advertisement prefixed to the Reconciler : An Epistle pacificatory of the seeming differences of opinion concerning the truthness and visibility of the Roman Church.

² In Scotland no member of the Church has fallen off to Romanism or any of the heresies which have distracted it; in Edinburgh alone, the Romanists boast of 100 converts from Presbyterianism yearly.

³ Vindication of Grotius, Disc. 3, quoted Catena Tracts, lxxiv. p. 14.

⁴ Unreasonableness of Separation, Pref. quoted ib. p. 25.

“ and with least understanding against it; whereas
“ no persons do really give them greater advantages
“ than these do. For, where they meet only with
“ intemperate railings, and gross misunderstandings
“ of the state of the controversies between them and
“ us (which commonly go together), the most subtle
“ priests let such alone to spend their rage and fury;
“ and when the heat is over, they will calmly en-
“ deavour to let them see how grossly they have
“ been deceived in some things, and so will more
“ easily make them believe, they are as much de-
“ ceived in all the rest. And thus the East and
“ West may meet at last, and the most furious
“ antagonists may become some of the easiest con-
“ verts. This I do really fear will be the case of
“ many thousands among us, who now pass for most
“ zealous Protestants; if ever, which God forbid, that
“ religion should come to be uppermost in England.
“ It is, therefore, of mighty consequence for prevent-
“ ing the return of Popery, that men rightly under-
“ stand what it is. For, when they are as much
“ afraid of an innocent ceremony as of real idolatry,
“ and think they can worship images and adore the
“ Host on the same grounds that they may use the
“ sign of the Cross, or kneel at the Communion,
“ when they are brought to see their mistake in one
“ case, they will suspect themselves deceived in the
“ other also. . . . When they find undoubted practices
“ of the Ancient Church condemned as Popish and
“ Antichristian by their teachers, they must conclude

“ Popery to be of much greater antiquity than really
“ it is ; and when they can trace it so very near the
“ Apostles’ times, they will soon believe it settled by
“ the Apostles themselves. For it will be very hard
“ to persuade any considering men, that the Christian
“ Church should degenerate so soon, so unanimously,
“ so universally, as it must do, if Episcopal govern-
“ ment, and the use of some significant ceremonies,
“ were any parts of that apostacy.”

I have now, I trust, said enough, my Lord, to allay in some degree the strange alarms, which seemed to have almost scared people “ from their propriety.” In this alarm it is not strange that their fears should have been increased by the compliments, bestowed by Romanists upon what we have put forth as the Anglican system. In some of them, this may have been sincere, for if they can find Romanism in Antiquity, as easily of course, may they find it in the Anglican system, which wishes to be a faithful representative of Antiquity ; or if Ultra-Protestants think what we are persuaded is the system of our Church an approximation to Romanism, so may the Romanists, as contrasted with Ultra-Protestantism ; and those who accuse us of a Romanist tendency, are, of course, animating them to more vigorous efforts against our Church by holding out these delusive prospects of co-operation within her own camp. These may be sincere, for not many years past, when on the establishment of the new University at Bonn, a place of worship was set apart for the Lutherans, some Romanists ex-

pressed to an eminent Lutheran theologian, their joy, that they were returning to the bosom of the true Church. The ground of this hope was that they had regular, though not daily, service, which they had not before. The Romanist regards all Church order as belonging to him; disorder to those not in communion with his Church, and so, any increase of order seems to him a return to *his* Church, as, in truth, a Church which has daily service, and weekly Communion, has something in common with *his* Church, which a body that neglects these has not; but only so far in common, as she agrees with Antiquity; for our Church, if she realize her weekly communions, has a privilege which, in that of Rome, the laity have not, nor a daily service in a language which they understand.

But though some, especially the Romanist Laity, may be really misled, charity cannot suppose that those who are versed in the controversy between their Church and our's, are sincere in their congratulations on this revival of Catholic truth, which had slept among us. They know too well who are their true foes; they even, now and then¹, let some signs of annoyance escape them, even in the midst of their assumed ease and joy, like the Spartan boy, whose entrails the stolen fox was gnawing; they feel that their own game is being spoiled; they had hoped to come upon us unprepared, or armed with Ultra-Pro-

¹ In the Dublin Review.

testant weapons, which had never been proved in any real conflict ; and they are mortified at seeing us donning the ancient armour, which has stood proof against them in many a conflict, and which they have never been able to pierce. They had hoped, by aid of what is really ancient in their system, to bring back among us their own modern corruptions, by aid of what is Catholic to introduce what is peculiar to Rome : they are annoyed at finding the posts pre-occupied, that our Church is conscious of her position, that she possesses stored up for her children every thing which they could hold out as an inducement to them to fall away to Rome. And so they have resorted to the corrupt policy which they practised of old against our Church, and would make men suspicious of the truth, as independent of their corruptions, knowing that if the truth be removed, men must fall sooner or later to their errors. If they can but bring our people out of the straight path, they doubt not that they must fall into their nets ; if they but set them against the pure truth, they must receive it drugged with other ingredients. Rome has enough of truth to prevail every where, except against Catholic truth itself ; it has been gaining upon the bodies which have severed themselves from our Church ; it knows well what are weak defences and what are strong ; it would draw us out of our strong-holds, and taunt us to abandon them and make us suspicious of them, as if they belonged to her. "It¹ is a matter of history, that

¹ Crosthwaite, Sermons on the Christian Ministry and the

“some of the first and most active promoters of Puri-
 “tanism, and afterwards of Non-conformity, were Ro-
 “man Catholic priests, who received orders, or pre-
 “tended to receive orders in our Church, that in the
 “disguise of friends they might more effectually disturb
 “and smite it. These men did not dare to broach the
 “peculiar tenets of their Church, but they endeavoured
 “to disunite and decompose the fabric of our unity by
 “infusing doubts and scruples; by decrying the Eccle-
 “siastical discipline of our Church as an infringement
 “of Christian liberty; by objecting to our Liturgy and
 “Cathedral service as formal and popish; by making
 “their hearers to join in more spiritual and exciting
 “devotions; and thus they gradually paved the way
 “for actual separation and dissent, and for all the
 “calamities which fell upon our country, and from
 “which we have never yet recovered. There is also
 “positive proof, that for a very considerable period,
 “Jesuits were regularly educated on the continent,
 “and sent over to these countries to enter into the
 “ministry, not only of our Church, but of every sect
 “in the nation.”—Rome is unchanged; only her task
 has become easier, since she then had to set people
 against what were the acknowledged tenets of the
 Church, and to stir up men’s minds to disaffection
 against their Church; now our Church is divided

Establishment of Christianity, p. 124. In the Appendix, Note B,
 p. 143 seqq. is much curious evidence carefully brought together
 on the part which disguised Romanists took in preaching up
 Puritanism and declaiming against the Church as Popish.

against herself, and a large portion of her sons and ministers have unlearnt in some respects the teaching of their Church, and are ready to disown it. But the line taken by Rome is the same. As her emissaries then declaimed against the use of the cross, "the service of the Church," "the communion table placed altar-ways" as Popish, so now would she create a suspicion against those who vindicate the ancient meaning of that service and who speak of the "altar" or the "cross," as if they belonged to her; and they who have much in their mouths the craftiness and subtlety of Rome, are simple enough to suppose that she would thus lay open her own movements, and set people on their guard against those who were preparing the way for her. No, my Lord! those who are really doing her work, she allows to work on in peace; and by aid of the daily press, labours to spread their opinions, and to identify them with the system of our Church; so shall he, she well knows, gain an easy victory! She can afford to have Rome evil spoken of, if but the true Anglican system be disparaged also. It is but the exchange of the fable, the wolf-cubs for the shepherd-dogs.

"It¹ was again replied, yourselves have preached so much against Rome and his holiness, that Rome and her Romanists will be little the better for that change; but it was answered, you shall have mass sufficient for 100,000 in a short space, and the go-

¹ Romanist Consultations, in letter of Archbishop Bramhall, *ib.* p. 156.

“vernors never the wiser.” Let Rome but undermine the credit of the English doctrines as papistical, and she would have no difficulty in erecting her own upon the ruins. For the mind yearns toward the truth, and cannot wander about for ever, not knowing where to rest the sole of its foot; if she misses a “sure resting place,” she will afterwards take up with whatever seems least likely to betray her footing; if she miss of truth in its purest and most awful form, she will afterwards be too glad to embrace it, amid whatever corruptions she may find it.

But we feel confident that it will not be so among us; the cloud of suspicion that now lowers about us will, with a little patience disperse; it is a good omen that we are attacked by the same who are joined in an unnatural union against our Church, Romanist and Dissenter and Latitudinarian; and if to these are, for the present, added many well-meaning members of our own Church, yet this has its origin in some natural misconception only, and will subside of itself, when they see our meaning more fully. Their prejudice lies not against the truths which we hold, but against certain consequences thought to be derived from them, or a negative way, in which they were in the last century held by many; or they see not how to reconcile them with other truths which are indisputable, or with tenets which they have been taught to think so; or they fear their effects on holiness of life; or they know not how to distinguish them from Romish cor-

ruptions of them, or they may be deterred by what of human infirmity may have cleaved to our statements. These and the like take time to remove.

But their fears will subside, and that the sooner, I doubt not, for the very extravagance of this temporary panic; and they who have been the most alarmed at the picture which periodicals have drawn of the principles put forward by us in the name of our Church, will embrace them the most fully when they learn their real character. They fear not our principles or practices, but principles or practices which we also should fear as well as they, and which have been given out for our's; they dread not the effects of our principles, but effects, which they have been led to associate with them, and which we should deprecate as truly; and when they see that veneration for Antiquity can be combined with thankfulness for the purity of our own Church¹; that our views on Justification lead men off themselves to cast them on their Redeemer, justifying them freely, and keeping them justified by His Spirit, forgiving them freely, and crowning freely His own gifts in them; that our statements of sin after Baptism lead them the rather to His fulness of mercy, and amid acts of self-abasement, or self-chastening, or charity, to look not to these acts but to Him, to seek for their peace at His hand, whether directly or through the Ordinances of the Church, not from themselves, or from their works;

¹ See Index to Appendix, v. Anglo-Catholics, and Tract, No. 86.

that our views on the Sacraments tend to humble the Priest¹, while they exalt the Priestly Office, and teach men, not to rest on any *opus operatum*, but to guard and keep themselves the more diligently, because God has deigned so to sanctify them; that the doctrine of the Apostolical succession tends to order and submissiveness within, and promotes charity and compassion for those without;—they will, we doubt not, examine the teaching of their Church more dispassionately than hitherto, and find it, in the main outline, to be what we have declared it.

Already an earnest of this has been given; and

¹ The confessions of the Priests in the Ancient Liturgies, previous to the celebration of Divine Offices, imply very deep humiliation. It is only the corruptions of the Church of Rome, which tend to infuse spiritual pride into the priesthood; the true doctrine humbles him. The following is the beginning of a confession in the Euchologion, to be said by the Priest for himself in the Baptismal service, (Assem. Ccd. Lit. t. ii. p. 133, 4.)

“ O compassionate and merciful God, who searchest the heart
 “ and reins, and Alone knowest the secrets of men, there is no
 “ thing hidden from Thee, but all things are naked, open to Thine
 “ eyes. Thou who knowest all of me, cast me not away, nor
 “ turn Thy face from me, but overlook my offences at this hour,
 “ Thou that overlookest the sins of men on repentance. Wash
 “ away the filth of my body and the defilement of my soul, and
 “ sanctify me wholly and entirely with Thy invisible power and
 “ spiritual right hand, lest announcing freedom to others, and im-
 “ parting it through the faith of Thy unspeakable love for men,
 “ I myself should be a castaway, as the servant of sin. Nay, O
 “ Lord, who only art Good and compassionate, let me not be
 “ turned away ashamed, but send forth to me power from on high,
 “ and strengthen me to this ministry.”

the almost electric rapidity with which these principles are confessedly passing from one breast to another, from one end of England to the other, the sympathy, which they find in the sister or daughter Churches of Scotland and America, might well make men suspect that there is more than human agency at work; this indeed has been acknowledged; and they who have not seen God's hand in it have attributed it to Satan¹; yet will they too in time we trust, see its fruits to be good, and acknowledge that Satan is not "divided against himself;" and now also they attribute to him, we hope, not the actual workings, but rather those which they apprehend. A note has been struck (I may speak, my Lord, on this subject, as not speaking boastfully, since it was not I who thought of striking it,) which has vibrated through every part of the frame of our Church, attesting at once the unity of the body, which so responded, and that itself had been attuned to it by a higher unseen Hand. They who struck the note were but as the bow in the hand of Him, who blends into harmony men's discordant wills, and out of their varying affections brings forth one concordant whole. Others have assayed to do it before and as faithfully, and under circumstances which seemed more favourable, yet none answered; "they piped, but none danced; they mourned, but, "none wept:" and now that some of the doctrines had seemed to be gradually expiring, and those who

¹ Essays, p. 278. seqq.

had handed them down amid a forgetful generation, were drawing toward the close of their labours, the closed ear has been unsealed, and the sleeping sympathy been awakened; showing in both cases Whose it is to “waken¹ the ear to hear as the learned;” perhaps, as the prelude of a time, when, more than hitherto, “the eyes² of the blind shall be opened, and “the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped.” For all things seem to be drawing one way. The simultaneous tendency towards a more Church-feeling among ourselves, among bodies separated from us, or again in Germany and Denmark feeling after it, (although in the absence of a Church-system which has been preserved to us, not knowing where to find it,) the increased energy of Romanism itself, (at least in France and America where it exists in its least corrupted form,) all point to some further coming of the Redeemer’s kingdom, when what is done shall be done in His Name, not in man’s; by His Church, and by individuals as members of it, not in themselves. The watch-word for our reunion is that, wherein God had made us one in Himself, His Church; not as an establishment, or as unestablished,—these are but accidents in her existence, and to be dealt with according to the Apostolic rule, “wherein any have been “called, therein let him remain with God,” in England let us not seek to be unestablished, nor in the United States to be established—not as an instrument

¹ Is. l. 4.

² Ib. xxxv. 5.

of temporal or spiritual power, but as a well-ordered society, invested with spiritual gifts, and having a spiritual existence, and united with its Invisible Head, the channel of His graces to us, and wherein we are in Him, wherein "God hath set¹, first, "Apostles" (and as their successors, the Bishops), "secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers," for "the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for "the edifying of the body of CHRIST, till we all come, "in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the "Son of GOD unto [one] perfect man, unto the "measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ²." Disunion has been the bane of the Church, ever since suspicion and separation fell upon the Eastern and Western Churches; attempts outwardly to cement what has been so severed have ever failed: so an inanimate body may be cemented, not a living and spiritual body: but now that men's spirits in different countries seem to be drawn—not directly together or to compass unions of Churches by man's arrangement or human wisdom, but to converge—towards One common centre, wherein all shall find themselves united; when men severally mourn over the decay in which the City of GOD lies, and "pity³ "the dust thereof," then may we hope that "the heathen shall fear the Name of the Lord, and all the "kings of the earth His glory," then "the Lord shall "build up Zion, He shall appear in His glory;" and

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 28.² Eph. ii. 12.³ Ps. cii. 13—16.

our "night of heaviness" shall be past, and "joy come" in the "dawning of the morning" which the Christian Church has so long "watched for." When we feel the miseries of our disunion, and humble ourselves for our share of it, then may we hope that He "will bind up the breaches," and the "One shepherd" will restore the fences of our "one fold," when we have learnt to long for it.

To you, my Lord, in whatever degree we might hope that we were in this our portion of the Vineyard but the lowest and meanest labourers towards this glorious restoration, we owe much real thanks, as well for the fatherly encouragement which you have given us, as for the warning which you have conveyed to those especially, who have learned of us. It has been a singular mercy of GOD to us hitherto, that no extravagance has connected itself with the doctrines to which we have claimed attention. Such had perhaps never been the case at any former restoration of forgotten doctrine. It is a familiar argument in such cases, that "the abuse is no argument against the use," and the very frequency of the maxim shows how closely the abuse attends upon the use. When a system now very popular was commenced, it had often to apologize for the extravagancies of those to whom it was a passage to dissent; and even of late years, it has not been unfrequent that even Ministers of this class have fallen off into schism: to us, they have been able to object at present what they deem a *tendency* only towards Ro-

manism, but have not shown any case in which that tendency has been followed out. And this, as we thankfully acknowledge it to have been a great mercy of God, so has He doubtless in part thereby brought it about, that these doctrines have in the first instance mainly taken root in the University, which nurtured ourselves. For the solid and real and self-denying training and discipline which has made this University what it is, has prepared the minds of those committed to her, to receive simply and solidly and practically, the Catholic system, when they became acquainted with it. Catholic truth is indeed so intrinsically practical, that it is less exposed than any human system, however apparently spiritual, to be received as a mere theory. Even while it has been embraced without any consciousness of sacrifices involved, it has in well-prepared minds gradually drawn toward the shore those whom it had inclosed in its net; they contentedly found their liberty circumscribed; the submission to rightful authority characteristic of the true Catholic system repressed too individual tendencies; it wound itself around them; encircled them with its solemn rounds of duties and devotions and abstinences, thwarting the natural will, and subduing self, calming the passions and elevating the affections; not acting turbidly, but rather unloosing limb by limb from their enthrallments, and gently moulding and fashioning them to perform the fuller measures of the duties of the Gospel. It is of the very nature of Catholic truth to merge self, and with

it the extravagances of self, in the sense of being a member of CHRIST in the Communion of His glorious Saints; to suppress thoughts, as if any were doing great things, by the sense of doing them under authority and guidance. One has begun probably by one portion of the system, another by another, as Providence guided his disposition or his circumstances; yet as he took up, one by one, increasing duties, he found himself but filling up voids in himself; his unevenness or inequalities softened; inconsistencies subdued, and himself by each such approximation, only rendered less out of harmony with the system in which he was placed; not thinking himself "some great one," but rather "an unprofitable servant," who was slowly learning to "do that which it was his duty to do."

But although such, by the mercy of GOD, has been the course of things hitherto, and one may appeal with confidence to the general character of our younger members, who whether consciously or unconsciously have been absorbed into the system, that this change has, as a whole, manifested itself in a subdued and chastened spirit, we cannot expect that if the purifying obloquy, under which we now lie, should be withdrawn, there will not be found those who will embrace that system intellectually only, or take the shadow for the substance, and so bring evil repute upon it. Satan has ever sown tares among the wheat; and the parable seems by its frequent fulfilment to have the nature of a prophecy, that it should ever be so. If the

Church be that great instrument of blessing, which Scripture implies, and which we in our Creeds profess, one must expect that Satan will in varying ways endeavour to seduce men from realizing it, and to continue their depreciation of it. It were too bold to hope that the truths now anew recognized, will not be overcast by some clouds, which the god of this world may be permitted to interpose. Enough, if their general influence be to warm and kindle. Even of Divine Grace it has been said, that "like the sun, whom it does not soften, it hardens," much more than of any form of Divine Truth.

It were then nothing, at which to be dismayed, were Satan allowed in some cases, to pervert these doctrines, and mislead into Popery some who had partially embraced them. There was a Simon Magus among the first baptized Christians; the Anabaptists and the Socinians were a produce of the reformation. We are conscious also, that the press is but a rude way of disseminating truth; it conveys it on the whole, but unadapted to particular cases; and so it often happens, as in the case of human medicines, that persons will misapply them, those who need them will neglect them, others use them wrongly, or employ them, while continuing in habits of life, which neutralize them, or make them pernicious. In a sounder state of the Church, where all the members of our flocks would have spiritual advisers, and the advisers themselves be more carefully trained, this evil

would be much mitigated ; meanwhile, the system will bear the blame of what it would provide against, would men but adopt it completely.

This is said only for fear “ offences should come,” and some be scandalized at them ; for the present, the influence of these truths has been rather exercised in the contrary and their rightful direction ; furnishing a resting-place from Romanism to some who were wandering thither, and recovering others from it to the bosom of our English branch of the Church : meanwhile we commit cheerfully our way unto Him who has thus far prospered His truth ; trusting, not in the Church-system, but in Him who ordered it ; not in the force of truth only, but in Him Who is the Truth ; not in the Church, but in Him Who is “ its Saviour,” and “ Who gave Himself for “ it, that He might cleanse it by the washing of “ water in the word, and present it to Himself a “ glorious Church not having spot or wrinkle, or any “ such thing, but that it might be holy and without “ blemish.” That your Lordship’s endeavours for the good of that portion of the Church committed unto you, may be prospered, is our daily prayer : to obey your godly admonitions, and to follow your guidance, is our earnest desire. May He, who has called you to this high office, make it hereafter your crown and joy, and requite you, as well for your labours and anxieties, as for your kindness to those who labour under you in the Vineyard.

With true respect for your sacred character, and
(if it not be too bold) affectionate acknowledgment of
your unvarying kindness,

I have the honour to remain,

Your Lordship's faithful Servant,

E. B. PUSEY.

CHRIST CHURCH,
Feast of St. Matthias, 1839.

A P P E N D I X.

EXTRACTS

FROM THE

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES,

THE

LYRA APOSTOLICA,

AND

OTHER PUBLICATIONS;

SHOWING THAT

TO OPPOSE ULTRA-PROTESTANTISM

IS NOT

TO FAVOUR POPERY.

EXTRACTS,

&c.

EXTRACTS FROM THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.

1. "It is certain that the Bishops and Clergy in England and Ireland remained the same as before the separation; and that it was these, with the aid of the civil power, who delivered the Church of those kingdoms from the yoke of Papal tyranny and usurpation; while at the same time they gradually removed from the minds of the people various superstitious opinions and practices which had grown up during the middle ages."—No. 15. p. 4.

2. "That there is not a word in Scripture about our duty to obey the Pope, is quite clear. The Papists, indeed, say that he is the successor of St. Peter; and that, therefore, he is head of all Bishops, because St. Peter bore rule over the other Apostles. But though the Bishops of Rome were often called the successors of St. Peter in the early Church, yet every other Bishop had the same title. And though it be true that St. Peter was the *foremost* of the Apostles, that does not prove that he had any dominion over them. . . . And so Rome has ever had what is called the *primacy* of the Christian Churches, but it has not, therefore, any right to interfere in their internal administration."—*Ibid.* p. 5.

3. "But it may be said, that we have really no valid orders, as having received them from an heretical Church. True, Rome may be so considered now; but she was not heretical in the primitive ages."—*Ibid.* p. 10.

4. "It may be said, that we threw blame on Luther, and others of the foreign Reformers, who *did* act without the authority of their Bishops. But we reply, that it has been always agreeable to the principles of the Church, that, if a Bishop taught and upheld what was contrary to the orthodox faith, the Clergy and people were not bound to submit, but were obliged to maintain the true religion."—*Ibid.* p. 11.

5. "While they [the writer and others] consider that the revival of this portion of truth is especially adapted to break up existing parties in the Church, and to form instead a bond of union among all who love the LORD JESUS CHRIST in sincerity; they believe that nothing but these neglected doctrines, faithfully preached, will repress that extension of Popery, for which the ever-multiplying divisions of the religious world are too clearly preparing the way."—*Advertisement to Vol. i. p. 5.*

6. "You have some misgivings, it seems, lest the doctrine I have been advocating 'should lead to Popery.' I will not, by way of answer, say, that the question is not whether it will *lead to Popery*, but whether it is *in the Bible*; because it would bring the Bible and Popery into one sentence, and seem to imply the possibility of a 'communion' between 'light and darkness.' No; it is the very enmity I feel against the Papistical corruptions of the Gospel, which leads me to press upon you a doctrine of Scripture, which we are sinfully surrendering, and the Church of Rome has faithfully retained.

"How comes it that a system so unscriptural as the Popish makes converts? Because it has in it an element of truth and comfort amid its falsehoods. And the true way of opposing it is not to give up to them that element, which God's providence has preserved to us also, thus basely surrendering 'the inheritance of our fathers,' but to claim it as our own."—*No. 20. p. 1.*

7. "Truly when one surveys the grandeur of their system, a sigh arises in the thoughtful mind, to think that we should be separate from them; *Cum talis sis, utinam noster esses!*—But, alas! *AN UNION IS IMPOSSIBLE*¹. Their communion is infected with heterodoxy; we are bound to flee it as a pestilence. They have established a lie in the place of God's truth; and by their claim of immutability in doctrine, cannot undo the sin they have committed. They cannot repent. Popery must be destroyed; it cannot be reformed."—*Ibid. p. 3.*

8. "He has wonderfully preserved our Church as a true branch of the Church Universal, yet withal preserved it free from doctrinal heresy. It is Catholic and Apostolic, yet not Papistical. . . . Depend upon it, to insist on the doctrine of the visible Church is not to favour the Papists, it is to do them the most serious injury. It is to deprive them of their only strength."—*Ibid. p. 4.*

9. "— Though it may please God that we should suffer for a while—as we suffered, together with good King Charles, at the hands of the dissenters; as we suffered in the days of bloody Queen Mary, at the hands of the Roman Catholics; as we suffered during the first three hundred years after CHRIST, at the hands of the Heathens and the Jews, yet—eventually, triumph will await us."—*No. 23. p. 3.*

10. "As to the *manner* of the presence of the body and blood of our LORD in the Blessed Sacrament, we that are Protestant and Reformed, according to the ancient Catholic Church, do not search into the manner of it with perplexing inquiries. . . . Had the Romish maintainers of Transubstantiation done the same, they would not have determined and decreed, and then imposed as an article of faith absolutely necessary to salvation, a manner of presence, newly by them invented, under pain of the most direful curse; and there would have been in the Church less wrangling, and more peace and

¹ Vid. *infr.* Extract 50.

unity than now is.”—*No. 27. p. 2.—Bishop Cosin on Transubstantiation.*

11. “It is in vain that they bring Scripture to defend this their stupendous doctrine [transubstantiation]; and it is not true, what they so often and so confidently affirm, that the Universal Church hath always constantly owned it, being it was not so much as heard of in the Church for many ages, and hath been but lately approved by the Pope’s authority in the Councils of Lateran and Trent.”—*Ibid. p. 16.*

12. “The history of the Papists is this. Many centuries ago, strange and corrupt notions and practices prevailed in many of the Churches in Europe. Among others, people thought the Pope or Bishop of Rome was gifted with authority from Heaven to control all the branches of the Church on earth, and that his word was to be of more weight than even the Holy Scriptures themselves. But about three hundred years ago, the Bishops of the Church of England saw these errors in their true light.”—*No. 30. p. 5.*

13. “*Clericus.* Say more definitely what the charge against me is. *Laicus.* That your religious system, which I have heard some persons style the Apostolical, and which I so name by way of designation, is like that against which our forefathers protested at the Reformation.

C. I will admit it, *i. e.*, if I may reverse your statement, and say that the Popish system resembles it. Indeed, how could it be otherwise, seeing that all corruptions of the truth must be like the truth which they corrupt, else they would not persuade mankind to take them instead of it?”—*No. 38. p. 1.*

14. “Be assured of this,—no party will be more opposed to our doctrine, if it ever prospers and makes noise, than the Roman party. This has been proved before now. In the seventeenth century, the theology of the divines of the English Church was substantially the same as ours is; and it experienced the full hostility of the Papacy. It was the true *Via Media*: Rome sought to block up that way, as fiercely as the Puritans. History tells us this. In a few words, then, before we separate, I will state some of my irreconcilable differences with Rome as she is; and in stating her errors, I will closely follow the order observed by Bishop Hall in his treatise on *The Old Religion*, whose Protestantism is unquestionable.

I consider that it is unscriptural to say with the Church of Rome, that ‘we are justified by inherent righteousness.’

That it is unscriptural that ‘the good works of a man justified do *truly* merit eternal life.’

That the doctrine of transubstantiation, as not being revealed, but a theory of man’s devising, is profane and impious.

That the denial of the cup to the laity, is a bold and unwarranted encroachment on their privileges as CHRIST’S people.

That the sacrifice of masses, as it has been practised in the Roman

Church, is without foundation in Scripture or antiquity, and therefore blasphemous and dangerous.

That the honour paid to images is very full of peril, in the case of the uneducated, that is, of the great part of Christians.

That indulgences, as in use, are a gross and monstrous invention of later times.

That the received doctrine of purgatory is at variance with Scripture, cruel to the better sort of Christians, and administering deceitful comfort to the irreligious.

That the practice of celebrating divine service in an unknown tongue is a great corruption.

That forced confession is an unauthorized and dangerous practice.

That the direct invocation of saints is a dangerous practice, as tending to give, often actually giving, to creatures the honour and reliance due to the Creator alone.

That there are not seven sacraments.

That the Roman doctrine of Tradition is unscriptural.

That the claim of the Pope to be universal bishop is against Scripture and antiquity.

I might add other points in which also I protest against the Church of Rome, but I think it enough to make my confession in Hall's order, and so leave it."—*Ibid.* p. 11.

15. "Rome has to confess her Papal corruptions, and her cruelty towards those who refuse to accept them."—*No.* 8. p. 4.

16. "The Church has in a measure forgotten its own principles, as declared in the sixteenth century; nay, under stranger circumstances, as far as I know, than have attended any of the errors and corruptions of the Papists. Grievous as are their declensions from primitive usage, I never heard in any case of their practice directly contradicting their services; whereas we go on lamenting once a year the absence of discipline in our Church, yet do not even dream of taking any one step towards its restoration."—*No.* 41. p. 1.

17. "Do you not suppose that there are multitudes both among clergy and laity at the present day, who disparage not indeed CHRIST's merits, but the sacraments He has appointed? and if so, is not their error so far the same in kind as that of the Romish church—the preferring Abana and Pharpar to the waters of Jordan? . . . Happily we are not as yet so corrupted as at the era of the Reformation; . . . yet is not the mode of viewing the subject I refer to, a growing one, and how does it differ from the presumption of the Papists? In both cases the power of CHRIST's sacraments is denied; in the one case by the unbelief of restlessness and fear, in the other by the unbelief of profaneness."—*Ibid.* p. 2.

18. "Our Reformers in the sixteenth century did not touch the existing documents of doctrine; there was no occasion; they kept the creeds as they were; but they *added* protests against the corruptions of faith, worship, and discipline, which had grown up round them."—*Ibid.* p. 3.

19. "While Dissenters are exclusive on the one hand, Papists are so on the other. The council of Trent converted certain theological opinions into (what they maintained to be) Catholic verities. This was wrong, whoever did it; but it is some comfort to find, that the body that thus became uncatholic, was not the Church Catholic itself."—*No. 61. p. 3.*

20. "This case [departure from antiquity] had been instanced even before Vincentius's time, in the history of the Arians. In our own day it is fulfilled in the case of the Church of Rome, which indeed has not erred *vitally*, as the Arians did, nor has infected with its errors the whole Church, yet has to answer for very serious corruptions, which it has not merely attempted, but managed to establish in a great part of the Churches of Christendom. Here then apply Vincentius's test—Antiquity; and the Church of Rome is convicted of unsoundness, as fully as those other sects among us which have already been submitted to the trial."—*Records of the Church, No. XXIV. p. 3.*

21. "How miserably contrasted are we with the One Holy Apostolic Church of old, which 'serving with one consent,' spoke 'a pure language!' And now that Rome has added, and we have omitted in the catalogue of sacred doctrines, what is left to us but to turn our eyes sorrowfully and reverently to those ancient times, and, with Bishop Ken, make it our profession to live and 'die in the faith of the Catholic Church before the division of the East and West?'" —*Ibid. No. XXV. p. 11.*

22. "The following are selected by way of specimen of those practical grievances to which Christians are subjected in the Roman communion:—1. The denial of the cup to the laity. 2. The necessity of the priest's intention to the validity of the sacraments. 3. The necessity of confession. 4. The unwarranted anathemas of the Roman Church. 5. Purgatory. 6. Invocation of saints. 7. Images." —*No. 71. p. 9, et seq.*

23. "We cannot consent to confine ourselves to a mere reference to the text of the Tridentine decrees, as Romanists would have us, apart from the teaching of their doctors, and the practice of the Church, which are surely the legitimate comment upon them. . . . The conduct of the Catholics during the troubles of Arianism affords us a parallel case. They interpreted the language of the Creeds by the professed opinions of their framers. They would not allow error to be introduced into the Church by an artifice. . . . Apply this to the case of Romanism. We are not indeed allowed to take at random the accidental doctrine or practice of this or that age, as an explanation of the decrees of the Latin Church; but when we see clearly that certain of these decrees have a natural tendency to produce certain evils, when we see those evils actually existing far and wide in that Church, in different nations and ages, existing especially where the system is allowed to act most freely—under such circumstances surely it is not unfair to consider our case parallel to that of the Catholics

during the ascendancy of Arianism—and to apprehend that, did we express our assent to the creed of Pope Pius, we should find ourselves bound hand and foot—to the corruptions of those who profess it.”—*Ibid.* p. 15, *et seq.*

24. “Should it be inquired whether this admission of incompleteness in our own system does not lead to projects of change and reform, on the part of individuals, it must be answered plainly in the negative. Such an admission has but reference to the question of *abstract* perfection; as a practical matter, it will be our wisdom as individuals to enjoy what God’s good providence has left us, lest, striving to obtain more, we lose what we still possess.”—*Ibid.* p. 35.

25. “One great unfairness practised by Roman controversialists has been to adduce in behalf of their own peculiarities, doctrines or customs of the primitive Church, which resembling them in appearance are really of a different character. Thus because the early Fathers spoke of the Holy Communion in such reverent and glowing terms, as became those who understood its real nature and virtue, they have tried to make it appear that they believed in their own theory of transubstantiation. Whereas they spoke of it as a *commemorative* sacrifice, they have thence taken occasion to make it a *real* and *proper* sacrifice. The doctrine of ecclesiastical penances they have converted into the theory of satisfactions to Almighty God for sins committed. The existence of *Apostolical tradition* in the early Church, in behalf of the doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation, and the like, has been made a pretence for introducing *so-called* Apostolical traditions concerning various unfounded opinions in faith and practice.”—*No.* 72. p. 1.

26. “Of course there is no reason why the Church might not, in the use of her discretion, limit as well as select the portions of the inspired volume which were to be introduced into her devotions; but there were serious reasons why she should not defraud her children of ‘their portion of meat in due season;’ and it would seem as if the eleventh, or at least the twelfth century, a time fertile in other false steps in religion, must be charged also, as far as concerns Rome and its more intimate dependencies, with the partial removal of the light of the written word from the sanctuary.”—*No.* 75. p. 7.

27. “Haymo’s edition, which was introduced into the Roman Church by Nicholas III. A. D. 1278, is memorable for another and still more serious fault. Graver and sounder matter being excluded, apocryphal legends of saints were used to stimulate and occupy the popular mind; and a way was made for the use of those invocations to the Virgin and other saints, which heretofore were unknown in public worship. The addresses to the Blessed Mary in the Breviary, as it is at present constituted, are such as the following: the Ave Mary, before commencing every office through the day, and at the end of compline; at the end of Lauds and Vespers, an Antiphon invocatory of the Virgin; the Officium B. Mariæ on the Sabbath or Saturday,

and sundry other offices, containing hymns and antiphons in her honour. These portions of the Breviary carry with them their own plain condemnation, in the judgment of an English Christian; no commendation of the general structure and matter of the Breviary itself will have any tendency to reconcile him to them, &c. . . . These usages [Invocations] certainly *now* do but sanction and encourage that direct worship of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, which is the great practical offence of the Latin Church.”—*Ibid.* p. 9.

28. “They [the Invocations] are here given in order to show clearly, as a simple inspection of them will suffice to do, the utter contrariety between the Roman system, as actually existing, and our own; which, however similar in certain respects, are in others so at variance, as to make any attempt to reconcile them together in their present state, perfectly nugatory. Till Rome moves towards us, it is quite impossible that we should move towards Rome; however closely we may approximate to her in particular doctrines, principles, or views.”—*Ibid.* p. 23.

29. “And further still, as regards the doctrine of purgatorial suffering, there have been for many ages in the Roman Church gross corruptions of its own doctrine, untenable as that doctrine is even by itself. The decree of the Council of Trent acknowledges the fact. Now we believe that those corruptions still continue; that Rome has never really set herself in earnest to eradicate them. The pictures of Purgatory so commonly seen in countries in communion with Rome, the existence of Purgatorian societies, the means of subsistence accruing to the clergy from belief in it, afford a strange contrast to the simple wording and apparent innocence of the decree by which it is made an article of faith. It is the contrast between poison in its lifeless seed, and the same developed, thriving, and rankly luxuriant in the actual plant.”—*No.* 79. p. 3.

30. [As to the tendency to substitute the Virgin as the object of religious worship.] “The great Catholic doctrine of the Trinity being so strongly established among them [the Romanists] by entering into all their devotional forms and creeds, that it could not be shaken; human depravity has sought out an opening for itself under another shape. It is by this means the natural heart lowers the object of its worship to its own frailty.”—*No.* 80. p. 80.

31. “The Romish Church corrupted and marred the Apostolic doctrine in two ways—first, by the error of Transubstantiation, secondly, by that of Purgatory; and in both there occurs that peculiar corruption of the administrators of the Romish Church, that they countenance so much more of profitable error than in their abstract system they acknowledge.”—*No.* 81. *On the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, p. 7.

32. “These false notions in themselves aggrandized the character of the priesthood: and as such, it was part of the unhappy policy

of Rome to countenance them ; and while (to take the mildest view) she narrowly observed the erroneous tendencies, which were almost unavoidably mixed up in the minds of individuals with the reformed doctrine, she had no sense for her own. She thought no deeds cruel, which would remove the notes that threatened to darken her sister's eye, but perceived not the beam in her own. While repressing, even by the shedding of blood, the slightest approximation to the reformed doctrine, she rebuked not errors which entrenched on the authority of our LORD."—*Ibid.* p. 8.

33. "The language of the Council (of Trent) on the Sacrifice is in itself capable of a good interpretation, were it not that terms employed in it must be explained with reference to that Church's acknowledged doctrines of Transubstantiation and Purgatory. AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE SACRIFICE CANNOT BE THE SAME, WHERE TRANSUBSTANTIATION IS HELD, AND WHERE IT IS NOT."—*Ibid.* p. 47.

EXTRACTS FROM "LYRA APOSTOLICA."

34. "Once, as I brooded o'er my guilty state,
A fever seized me, duties to devise
To buy me interest in my Saviour's eyes;
Not that His love I would extenuate,
But scourge and penance, and perverse self-hate,
Or gift of cost, served by an artifice
To quell my restless thoughts, &c. . . .
Thus as I tossed, He said: ' Even holiest deeds
Shroud not the soul from God, nor soothe its needs,' " &c.
Lyra Apostolica, (Ed. 2.) 9.
35. "I will not say with these, that bread and wine
Have vanished at the consecration prayer," &c. *Ibid.* 33.
36. "Ah, Saviour, LORD! with Thee my heart
Angel nor Saint shall share;
To Thee 'tis known, for man Thou art,
To soothe each tumult there."—*Ibid.* 51.
37. "They are at rest :
We may not stir the heaven of their repose
By rude invoking voice, or prayer address
In waywardness to those,
Who in the mountain grots of Eden lie," &c.—*Ibid.* 52.
38. "Mark how each Creed stands in that Test reveal'd,
Romish and Swiss and Lutheran novelties !
As in the light of Spenser's magic shield,
Falsehood lets fall her poisoned cup and flies,
Rome's seven-headed monster sees and dies !" —*Ibid.* 97.
39. "O LORD and CHRIST, Thy Churches of the South
So shudder, when they see

The two-edged sword sharp-issuing from Thy mouth,
 As to fall back from Thee,
 And seek to charms of man, or saints above,
 To aid them against Thee, Thou Fount of grace and love!

But I before Thine awful eyes will go,
 And firmly fix me there,
 In my full shame;" &c.—*Ibid.* 105.

40. "The flood-gates on me open wide,
 And headlong rushes in the turbulent tide
 Of lusts and heresies! a motley troop they come;
 And old imperial Rome
 Looks up, and lifts again half-dead
 Her seven-horned head;" &c.—*Ibid.* 111.
41. "How shall I name thee, Light of the wide West,
 Or heinous error-seat?
 O Mother erst, close tracing Jesus' feet!
 Do not thy titles glow
 In those stern judgment fires, which shall complete
 Earth's strife with Heaven, and ope the eternal woe?"
Ibid. 170.
42. "O Mother Church of Rome! why has thy heart
 Beat so untruly towards thy northern child?
 Why give a gift, nor give it undefiled,
 Drugging thy blessing with a stepdame's art? &c.
 . . . And now thou sendest foes
 Bred from thy womb, lost Church! to mock the throes
 Of thy free child, thou cruel-natured Rome!"—*Ibid.* 171.
43. "O that thy creed were sound!
 For thou dost soothe the heart, thou Church of Rome,
 By thy unwearied watch and varied round
 Of service, in thy Saviour's holy home."—*Ibid.* 172.

EXTRACTS FROM THE WRITINGS OF DR. PUSEY.

44. "In different ways man would forestall the sentence of his judge; the Romanist by the sacrament of penance; a modern class of divines by the appropriation of the merits and righteousness of our blessed Redeemer; the Methodists by sensible experience; our own, with the ancient Church, preserves a reverent silence, not cutting off hope, and yet not nurturing an untimely confidence, or a presumptuous security."—*Pusey on Baptism*, p. xiv.

44. (b) "Lastly, I would beseech those, for whom these tracts are mainly intended, our younger labourers in the Lord's vineyard, for their own sakes, as well as of those, of whose souls they must give account, neither here, nor in any other portion of these tracts, to be deterred by any vague fear of an approximation (as they may

be led to think) to any doctrines or practices of the corrupt Church of Rome; not to allow themselves to fall in with any of those charges, which ignorant men are wont to make, of "the early corruptions of Christianity," and which are the bulwark of Socinianism, and of every other heresy. Since the Swiss reformers set aside primitive antiquity, and took a new model of their own, Antiquity, if tried by the standard of Zuinglianism or Calvinism, must, of course, appear to approximate to the modern Church of Rome; for that Church has retained, in a corrupted form, doctrines and rites, which the Swiss reformation rejected. Hence, the Lutheran (see p. 104), the Bohemian (p. 233), and our own Church, have, by the admirers of that reformation, ever been looked upon as Papistical; as they, in their turn, have, by the "extreme reformation of the Socinians" (p. 198-9), been held, and rightly, to have stopped short of the results of their own principles, and have been represented, though wrongly, as retainers of Alexandrian "corruptions of Christianity." Hooker's defence of our Church is but one instance of this wide difference between ours and the Zuinglian reformation. Our Church (blessed be God,) never took Luther, or Calvin, or any modern name for its teacher or its model, but primitive antiquity; and by the Holy Scripture alone, and the universal consent of Primitive Antiquity, as the depository of its doctrines, and the witness of its teaching, would she be judged¹. In these principles of our dear mother, the Church of England, have we been trained, and in these old ways we would humbly tread."—*Ibid.* p. xvii.

45. "We cannot sufficiently admire the lovingkindness of Almighty God, who allowed the seeds indeed of Reformation to be sown among us by Wickliffe; yet then, notwithstanding the powerful human aid which he had, and his great popularity, caused them to lie, as it were, in the earth, until those which were less sound should, by length of time, decay; and again, that He placed so many impediments in the way of our final Reformation (for what man does rapidly he does rashly), and held back our steps by the arbitrariness of Henry; and, when we were again going down the stream of the times too readily, checked us at once by the unexpected death of Edward, and proved us by the fire of the Marian persecution, and took away, by a martyr's death, those in whom we most trusted; and then finally employed a number of labourers, in the restoration of His Temple, of whom none should yet be so conspicuous, that the edifice should seem to be his design, or that he should be tempted to restore the decayed parts according to any theory of his own, but rather that all things should be made "according to the pattern which He had shown us in the Church primitive. Had our reform taken place at first, we had been Wickliffites; under Edward, we had been a branch of the Reformed

¹ There are some brief, but valuable notices of the peculiarity of the Church of England in the late Bishop Jebb's Pastoral Instructions, and some striking quotations from ancient divines, domestic and foreign, who have remarked it, as an excellence; so also in Bp. Bull's *Apologia pro Harmonia*, sect. I. § 4. ed. Burton.

Zuinglian or the Calvinist Church : now we bear no human name ; we look to no human founder ; we have no one reformer to set up as an idol ; we are neither of Paul nor of Apollos ; nor have we any human maxims or theories as the basis of our system ; but we have been led back at once to the distant fountains, where the waters of life, fresh from their source, flowed most purely."—*Ibid.* pp. 105, 106.

46. "In this, as in many other cases, we must distinguish between the practical corruptions of the Church of Rome and her theoretical errors. For it often happens that she leads her members into error, and countenances corruption in them, when her statements in themselves are not very unsound ; teaching us how much evil what seems a little departure from the truth may create."—*Ibid.* p. 192.

47. "In justice then to ourselves, as well as to the Romanists, we must bear in mind that the unhappy and fatal canons of the Council of Trent were directed, in part, against actual error, such as had mixed itself with the then, as well as with former, attempts at reformation. And we should do well to recollect that, though bound to thank God for all those, through whom the light of the Gospel shone more clearly, we always were regarded by them as a distinct and peculiar Church, and are not to identify ourselves with them."—*Ibid.* p. 194.

48. "Alexandria, the bulwark of the faith in the Holy Trinity, and North Africa, of the unmeritedness of God's free grace, a desolation ! Rome, once characterized for steady practical adherence to sound doctrine, a seat of Anti-Christ. Geneva, once proposed as the model of all reformed Churches, and of influence well nigh unbounded, and yet immediately the food of Socinianism, and now a prey to the heresy which came forth, but was for the time ejected, also from its bosom."—*Ibid.* p. 201.

49. "We can see how a person's whole views of Sanctification by the HOLY GHOST will be affected by Hoadly's low notions of the LORD'S Supper ; or how the error of Transubstantiation has modified other true doctrine, so as to cast into the shade the one oblation once offered upon the Cross ; or how the addition of the single practice of 'soliciting the saints to pray for men,' has in the Romish Church obscured the primary articles of Justification and of the Intercession of our Blessed LORD."—*Ibid.* 2nd Ed. p. 6.

50. "Having adopted the fiction of a letter from the Pope to certain members of your Church, as being his emissaries, it became necessary, by disguise, or omission, or perversion, to conceal whatever would have disturbed the unity of the drama. For instance, you play not unfrequently upon the words which one of these writers addresses to the Church of Rome—'Cum talis sis, utinam noster esses !' and who would not echo the wish . . . that she, as ourselves have been, might be restored to her primeval purity, when she was once the guardian of Christian truth ; that God would 'break the yoke of her burden, the staff on her shoulder, and the rod of her

oppressor?' Taken then in their obvious sense, the words are the expression of every Christian heart. Your fiction, however, required that they should express a desire for union with Rome *AS SHE IS*; and in this sense accordingly you quote them. The very next words of the writer contradict this. He proceeds (and to prevent the possibility of a mistake, he has printed these words in capitals): 'But, alas! *AN UNION IS IMPOSSIBLE.*' Honesty required the insertion of those words; but they would have spoiled the jest, and so they are omitted."—*Pusey's earnest Remonstrance to the author of the Pope's letter* (vide Vol. iii. of the Tracts), p. 8.

51. "The ground taken by the Church of Rome is that all *her present* traditions are to be received, as of equal validity with the written word, because she holds them; our ground, that they are not to be so received, because they cannot be proved to be apostolic, and some are corrupt and vainly invented. Our controversy then with Rome is not an *à priori* question on the value of tradition in itself . . . but is one purely historical, that the Romanist traditions not being such, but on the contrary repugnant to Scripture, are not to be received. . . . Nor does our accepting the traditions of the *Universal Church in their day*, involve our accepting those of the particular Church of Rome, after so many centuries of corruption, *in the present.*"—*Ibid.* p. 13.

52. "One not versed in history will be liable perpetually to confound the earlier truth, or unobjectionable custom, with the later corruption, especially if he has no very clear idea of Christian theology."—*Ibid.* p. 18.

53. "Now to this prayer (for the dead, in the first prayer-book,) neither Calvin nor Bucer objected that it was Papistical. On the contrary, Calvin says in his letter to the Protector, (Epp. p. 39. fol.) 'I hear that in the celebration of the Supper there is repeated a prayer for the departed, and I well know that *this cannot be construed into an approbation of the Papistical Purgatory.*'"—*Ibid.* p. 20.

54. "We never have, nor do we wish for any alteration in the liturgy of our Church; we bless God that our lot has fallen in her bosom,—that He has preserved in her the essentials of primitive doctrine and a liturgy so holy; and, although I cannot but think its first form preferable, alteration is out of the question: *THERE CANNOT BE REAL ALTERATION WITHOUT A SCHISM*; and as we claim to have our own consciences respected, so, even if we had the power of change, would we respect the consciences of others. . . . The whole course of the Tracts has, as you know, and yourself reproach us with, been against innovation."—*Ibid.* p. 28.

55. "You know that these authors had written also against Popery, and republished older writings against it: their very tracts are known by the name of 'Tracts against Popery and Dissent'; although, when they were commenced, dissent was everywhere a pressing evil, Popery had scarcely begun to bestir itself."—*Ibid.* p. 32.

56. "No one clergyman in or near Oxford has done any one thing as 'being justified by primitive antiquity;' but . . . whatever has

been done, has been done in obedience to the rubrics, or to carry them out into practice. . . . In no one church or chapel has any 'needless bowing' been introduced: clergymen, indeed, here always bow at the name of our Blessed LORD, wherever it occurs. . . . In the cathedral the dean and canons have from time immemorial, on leaving the choir, bowed to the altar. No cross has been added to the surplice; only one clergyman, who was at the time at Oxford, but not connected with any parish church, thinking this to be enjoined by the rubric prefixed to the Morning Prayers, 'wore in the train of his ministration such ornaments as were in this Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI.' The scarf had then, it is said, two small black crosses, one at each end. . . . Whether the dress were that of Edward VI. I cannot say; it is enough for the principle that it was adopted as being sanctioned by the Church; and besides, one instance does not imply a system. Of 'unusual attitudes of devotion,' I know of none."—*Pusey's Letter to Townsend* (*British Mag.* vol. xii. p. 368.)

57. "Now let me first recapitulate what it is which has been thus blazoned about and exaggerated:—one clergyman has worn a cross on his scarf in compliance, as he thought, with our rubric; two clergymen have in new congregations knelt towards the East, in conformity with the ancient, and recent, and still-existing practice of our Church; two have used a table, where the rubric implies that the elements must be placed somewhere, but says not how. Strong party-spirit has taken up these reports, not for their own sake (else why do they pass unnoticed irregular innovations in the mode of administering the Communion or Baptism?) but because it was easier so to cast a slur upon a body of men, and, through them, upon sound principles, than to refute them."—*Ibid.* p. 642.

58. "From the time that the Church of Rome began to forsake the principles of the Church Catholic, and grasp after human means, she began also to take evil means for good ends, and incurring the apostolic curse on those who 'do evil that good may come,' took at last evil means for evil ends. She, the Apostolic Church of the West, consecrated by Apostolic blood, showed herself rather the descendant of them who slew the Apostles, and 'thought that they did God service,' stained herself with the blood of the saints, that on her might come all the righteous blood which was shed within her; even of the very Apostles, who had shed blood for her. There is not an enormity which has been practised against people or kings by miscreants in the name of God, but the divines of that unhappy Church have abetted or justified."—*Pusey's Sermon on the Fifth of November*, p. 29.

59. "The principle of the Romish Church was expediency; it was a plotting, scheming, worldly spirit, having at first God's glory for its end, but seeking it by secular means, and at last, in punishment, left to seek its own glory, and to set itself up in the place of God."—*Ibid.* p. 31.

60. "It is not, God knoweth, in any spirit of boast against these branches, some of which were grafted in before us, but still in encouragement and warning, that I would notice, that herein also our Church followed the principles of the Church Catholic, and with her had been portioned. She alone of all the reformed Churches was purified in the fire, and purged by the blood of martyrs, and had the evidence of affliction that she was a beloved child, and no bastard."—*Ibid.* p. 32.

EXTRACTS FROM THE WRITINGS OF MR. NEWMAN.

61. "Various notions have led theological writers to implicate this celebrated Church [the Alexandrian] in the charge of heresy. . . . The Romanists have thought . . . to exalt the Apostolical purity of their own Church by the contrast of unfaithfulness in its early rival; and (what is of greater importance) to insinuate the necessity of an infallible authority, by exaggerating the errors and contrarieties of the ante-Nicene fathers, and the fact of its existence by throwing us upon the decisions of the later councils for the unequivocal statement of orthodox doctrine."—*Newman on Arianism*, p. 44.

62. "We agree with the Romanist in appealing to antiquity as our great teacher, but we deny that his doctrines are to be found in antiquity; and we maintain that his professed tradition is not really such, that it is a tradition of men, that it stops short of the Apostles, that the history of its introduction is known. On both accounts then his doctrines are innovations; because they run counter to the doctrine of antiquity, and because they rest upon what is historically an upstart tradition."—*Newman on Romanism*, p. 47, 48.

63. "How hopeless then is it to contend with Romanists, as if they practically agreed with us as to the foundation of faith, however much they pretend it! Ours is antiquity, theirs the existing Church. Its infallibility is their first principle; belief in it is a deep prejudice, quite beyond the reach of any thing external. It is quite clear that the combined testimonies of all the Fathers, supposing such a case, would not have a feather's weight against the decision of a Pope in Council."—*Ibid.* p. 86.

64. "We must take and deal with things as they are, not as they pretend to be. If we are induced to believe the professions of Rome, and make advances towards her as if a sister or a mother Church, which in theory she is, we shall find too late that we are in the arms of a pitiless and unnatural relation, who will but triumph in the arts which have inveigled us within her reach. No; dismissing the dreams which the romance of early Church history, and the high doctrines of Catholicism will raise in the inexperienced mind, let us be sure that she is our enemy, and will do us a mischief if she can. For in truth she is a Church beside herself, abounding in noble gifts and rightful titles, but unable to use them religiously; crafty, obstinate, wilful, malicious, cruel, unnatural, as madmen are, or rather, she may be

said to resemble a demoniac, . . . ruled within by an inexorable spirit."—*Ibid.* p. 102, 103.

65. " My next instance shall be the Roman doctrine of Purgatory. All Protestants are sufficiently alive to the seriousness of this error. Now I think it may be shown that its existence is owing to a like indulgence of human reason, and of private judgment upon Scripture, in default of Catholic tradition."—*Ibid.* p. 212.

66. " Whether we be right or wrong, our theory of religion has a meaning, and that really distinct from Romanism. They maintain that faith depends upon the Church ; we, that the Church is built upon the faith. By Church Catholic we mean the Church Universal ; they those branches of it which are in communion with Rome. Again, they understand by the faith, whatever the Church at any time declares to be faith ; we, what it has actually so declared from the beginning. Both they and we anathematize those who deny the faith ; but they extend the condemnation to all who question any decree of the Roman Church ; we apply it to those only who deny any article of the original Apostolic creed."—*Ibid.* p. 259.

67. " The Thirty-nine Articles then are instruments of teaching, of Catholic teaching, being, as far as they go, heads, as it were, of important chapters in revealed truth. And it is as thus viewing them that we put them before the young. They are quite consistent with the prerogative accorded, as we have seen, by antiquity to the Apostolic Creed, quite distinct from the tyrannical enforcement of the Tridentine articles on the part of Rome."—*Ibid.* p. 290.

68. " This statement (' that Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation,' Art. VI.) is very plain and clear except in one point, viz., who is to be the *judge* what is and what is not contained in Scripture. Our Church is silent on this point—very emphatically so. This is worth observing ; in truth she does not admit, strictly speaking, of any judge at all, in the sense in which Romanists and Protestants contend for one ; and in this point, as in others, holds a middle course between extreme theories. Romanism, as we all know, maintains the existence of a judge of controversies ; nay, an infallible one, that is, the Church Catholic. Again the multitude of Protestants consider every man his own judge ; they hold that every man may or must read Scripture for himself ; and judge about its meaning, and make up his mind for himself. We neither hold that the Catholic Church is an infallible judge of Scripture, nor that each individual may judge for himself ; but that the Church has *authority*, and that individuals may judge for themselves outside the range of that authority. The Church is not a *judge* of the sense of Scripture in the common sense of the word, but a *witness*—a keeper and witness of Catholic tradition. She bears witness to a fact that such and such a doctrine, or such a sense of Scripture, has ever been received, and came from the Apostles."—*Ibid.* p. 327, *et seq.*

69. " Nor let any one be startled at all this discordance of opinion among our divines, in their mode of proving one of the

great principles of Protestantism [Scripture the rule of faith], as if it reflected upon the wisdom or soundness of the principle itself. Above all, let not Romanists venture to take advantage of it, lest we retort upon them the vacillations, absurdities, intrigues, and jealousies displayed in the deliberations of divines attendant on their general councils."—*Ibid.* p. 346.

70. "If this line of argument can be maintained, there will be this especial force in it as addressed to Romanists. They are accustomed to taunt us with inconsistency, as if we used the tradition of the Church only when and as far as we could not avoid it. . . . We do *not* discard the tradition of the Fathers; we accept it; we accept it entirely; we accept its witness concerning itself and against itself. It witnesses to its own inferiority to Scripture."—*Ibid.* p. 349.

71. "Nothing I think is plainer from these extracts [some quoted from the Fathers] than that the authors of them looked upon Scripture as the public standard of proof, the tribunal of appeal in controversy."—*Ibid.* p. 399.

72. "Time went on, and he [Satan] devised a second idol of the true CHRIST, and it remained in the Temple of God for many a year. The age was rude and fierce. Satan took the darker side of the Gospel. . . . The religion of the world was then a fearful religion. Superstitions abounded, and cruelties. The noble firmness, the graceful austerity of the true Christian, were superseded by forbidding spectres, harsh of eye and haughty of brow; and these were the patterns or the tyrants of a beguiled people."—*Newman's Sermons*, vol. i. p. 359.

73. "Satan could not hinder, he could but corrupt the kingdom promised to the saints. He could but seduce them to trust in an arm of flesh. He could but sow the seeds of decay among them by alluring them to bow down to 'Ashtoreth the goddess of the Zidonians, and Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites,' and to make a king over them like the nations, 'when the LORD was their king.' Had it not been for this falling away in divers times and places, surely Christendom would not be in its present miserable state of disunion and weakness."—*Newman's Sermons*, vol. ii. p. 282.

74. "There have been ages of the world, in which men have thought too much of angels, and paid them excessive honour; honoured them so perversely as to forget the supreme worship due to Almighty God. This is the sin of a dark age."—*Ibid.* p. 400.

75. "It is too evident how grievously the church of Rome has erred in this part of Christian duty [zeal]. Let her doctrines be as pure as her defenders maintain, still she has undisputably made the church an instrument of worldly politics by a 'zeal not according to knowledge.' Let us grant that her doctrine was not fatally corrupted till the sixteenth century; nevertheless, from the eleventh at least she has made CHRIST'S kingdom of this world. I will not in-

quire whether she committed the additional most miserable sin of rebellion against Cæsar; though from what we see around us at this day there is great reason to fear that from the beginning of her power she has been tainted with it."—*Ibid.* p. 436.

76. "He will but observe that, if Popery be a perversion or corruption of the truth, as we believe, it must, by the mere force of the terms, be like that truth which it counterfeits; and, therefore, the fact of a resemblance, as far as it is borne out, is no proof of any essential approximation in his opinions to Popery as such. Rather, it would be a serious argument against their primitive character, if to superficial observers they bore no likeness to it. Ultra-Protestantism could never have been silently corrupted into Popery."—*Ibid.* vol. iii. *Advertisement.*

77. "A great part of the Christian world, as is well known, believes that after this life the souls of Christians ordinarily go into a prison called Purgatory, where they are kept in fire or other torment, till, their sins being burned away, they are at length fitted for that glorious kingdom into which nothing defiled can enter. Now, if there were any good reason for this belief, we should certainly have a very sad and depressing prospect before us. . . . But, in fact, CHRIST has mercifully interposed expressly to assure us that our friends are better provided for than this doctrine would make it appear. He assures us that they 'rest from their labours, and their works do follow them.'"—*Ibid.* p. 408.

78. "It is 'JESUS CHRIST, before our eyes evidently set forth, crucified among us.' Not before our bodily eyes; so far, every thing remains at the end of that heavenly communion as it did at the beginning. What was bread remains bread, and what was wine remains wine. We need no carnal, earthly, visible miracle to convince us of the presence of the LORD incarnate."—*Ibid.* vol. iv. p. 167.

79. "While we think thus of the invisible Church, we are restrained by many reasons from such invocations of her separate members as are unhappily so common in other Christian countries. First, because the practice was not primitive, but an addition, which the world had poured into the Church; next, because we are told to pray to God only, and invocation may easily be corrupted into prayer, and then becomes idolatrous. And further, it must be considered that though the Church is represented in Scripture as a channel of God's gifts to us, yet it is only as a body, and sacramentally, not as an agent, nor in her members one by one. St. Paul does not say that we are brought near to this saint or that saint, but to all together; to the spirits of just men made perfect."—*Ibid.* p. 207.

80. "Hence the charge, not unfounded as regards Romanism, that it views, or tends to view, the influences of grace, not as the operations of a living God, but as a something to bargain about, and buy, and traffic with, as if religion were, not an approach to things above us, but a commerce with our equals concerning things we can master."—*Newman on Justification*, p. 316.

81. "The view of justification taken by Romanists and by a school of divines among ourselves, tends to fix the mind on self, not on CHRIST; whereas that which I have advocated as Scriptural and Catholic, buries itself in the vision of a present, an in-dwelling God."—*Ibid.* p. 220.

82. "So much space has been given to Bucer's doctrine, because he is in a small degree connected with our own Reformation; and such as his has been the current doctrine of the English Church. Our divines, though of very different schools, have, with few exceptions, agreed in this, that justification is gained by obedience in the shape of faith; that is an obedience which confesses it is not sufficient, and trusts solely in Christ's merits for acceptance—not the Roman, that the obedience justifies without a continual imputation of Christ's merits; nor the Protestant, that the imputation justifies distinct from obedience."—*Ibid.* p. 420.

83. "The Council of Trent did, as regards Roman errors, what, for all we know, though God forbid, some future Synod of the English Church may do as regards Protestant errors, take them into her system, make them forms of communion, bind upon her hitherto favoured sons their grievous chain; and what that unhappy Council actually did for Rome, that does every one in his place and according to his power, who by declaiming against and denouncing those who dare to treat the Protestant errors as unestablished, gives a helping hand towards their establishment."—*Newman's Letter to Faussett*, p. 15.

84. "Who defends such things as these [worship of the Blessed Virgin]? who says the Church of Rome was free from them before Trent? . . . Why are the Tracts to be censured for stating a plain historical fact, that the Roman Church did not, till Trent, embody in her creed the mass of her present tenets, while they do not deny but expressly acknowledge her great corruptions before that era; while they give the history of Transubstantiation prior to Trent, (Nos. 27, 28.) of the breviary worship of the Blessed Virgin prior to Trent, (No. 79.) while they formally draw up points in which they feel agreement with Romanism to be hopeless, (Nos. 38, 71.) and while they declare, (in large letters to draw attention) that, while Rome is what it is, 'union' with it 'is impossible' (No. 20.)? All that can be said against them is, that in discussing the Roman tenets, they use guarded language; and thus I will say, that the more we have personal experience of the arduous controversy in question, the more shall we understand the absolute necessity, if we are to make any way, of weighing our words and keeping from declamation."—*Ibid.* p. 18.

85. "It is idolatry to bow down to any emblem or symbol as divine which God Himself has not appointed; and since He has not appointed the worship of images, such worship is idolatrous. . . . It is impossible for any religious man, *having* a crucifix, not to treat it with reverence . . . but . . . I more than doubt whether a crucifix, carved to represent life, as such memorials commonly are, be not

too true to be reverent, and too distressing for familiar contemplation. . . . So much I know, that the use of the crucifix is in this place no badge of persons whose mode of thinking you would condemn. How many crucifixes could be counted up in Oxford I know not; but you will find them in the possession of those who are no special friends or followers of Mr. Froude, and perhaps cordial admirers, except of course on this one point, of the tenor of your publication."—*Ibid.* p. 25. *In a Note*—"I know or have heard of the names of four persons altogether; one of the four I have forgotten, and another I cannot be sure I heard."

86. "O that we had the courage and the generous faith to aim at perfection, to demand the attention, to claim the submission of the world! Thousands of hungry souls in all classes of life stand around us; we do not give them what they want, the image of a true Christian people, living in that Apostolic awe and strictness which carries with it an evidence that they are the Church of CHRIST. This is the way to withstand and repel the Romanists; not by cries of alarm, and rumour of plots, and disputes, and denunciations, but by living up to the Creeds, the Services, the Ordinances, the usages of *our own* Church, without fear of consequences, without fear of being called Papists: to let matters take their course freely, and to trust to God's good Providence for the issue."—*Ibid.* p. 98.

EXTRACTS FROM FROUDE'S REMAINS,

87. "The Romanists [are not schismatics in England and Catholics abroad, but they] are wretched Tridentines every where."—*Froude's Remains*, vol. i. p. 434.

88. "I never could be a Romanist; I never could think all those things in Pope Pius' Creed necessary to salvation."—*Ibid.*

89. "We found to our horror, that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church made the acts of each successive Council obligatory for ever; that what had been once decided could not be meddled with again: in fact, that they were committed finally and irrevocably, and could not advance one step to meet us, even though the Church of England should again become what it was in Laud's time, or indeed what it may have been up to the atrocious Council [of Trent]; for M.— admitted that many things, *e. g.* the doctrine of mass, which were fixed then, had been indeterminate before. So much for the Council of Trent, for which Christendom has to thank Luther and the Reformers. . . . I own it has altogether changed my notions of the Roman Catholics, and made me wish for a total overthrow of their system."—*Ibid.* pp. 307, 308.

90. "I remember you told me that I should come back a better Englishman than I went away; better satisfied not only that our Church is nearest in theory right, but also that practically, in spite of its abuses, it works better; and, to own the truth, your prophecy is already nearly realized. Certainly I have as yet only seen the surface of things; but what I have seen does not come up to my

notions of propriety. These Catholic countries seem in an especial manner κατέχειν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ ["to hold the truth in unrighteousness."] And the priesthood are themselves so sensible of the hollow basis upon which their power rests, that they dare not resist the most atrocious encroachments of the State upon their privileges. . . . I have seen priests laughing when at the Confessional; and indeed it is plain that unless they habitually made light of very gross immorality, three-fourths of the population [of Naples] would be excommunicated. . . . The Church of England has fallen low, and will probably be worse before it is better; but let the Whigs do their worst, they cannot sink us so deep as these people have allowed themselves to fall while retaining all the superficials of a religious country."—*Ibid.* p. 293, 294.

91. "Since I have been out here, I have got a worse notion of the Roman Catholics than I had. I really do think them idolaters, though I cannot be quite confident of my information as it affects the character of the priests. . . . What I mean by calling these people idolaters is, that I believe they look upon the Saints and Virgin as good-natured people that will try to get them let off easier than the Bible declares, and that, as they don't intend to comply with the conditions on which God promises to answer prayers, they pray to them as a come-off. But this is a generalization for which I have not sufficient data."—*Ibid. vide Preface*, p. xiii.

EXTRACTS FROM THE WRITINGS OF MR. KEBLE.

92. "The deep and sincere dread with which Hooker regarded the errors and aggressions of Rome is apparent in every part of his writings; and so much the more instructive will it prove, should we find him of his own accord embracing those Catholic opinions and practices, which some in their zeal for popery may have too lightly parted with, but which, as Rome alone could not give them, so neither should we allow her indirectly to take them away."—*From the Preface to Hooker*. p. iv.

93. "King James II. it is well known, ascribed to Hooker, more than to any other writer, his own ill-starred conversion to Romanism: against which, nevertheless, if he had thought a little more impartially, he might have perceived that Hooker's works every where inculcate that which is the only sufficient antidote, respect for the true Church of the Fathers, as subsidiary to Scripture and a witness of its true meaning."—*Ibid.* p. cv.

94. "The Freedom of the Anglican Church may be vindicated against the exorbitant claims of Rome, and yet no disparagement ensue of the authority inherent in the Catholic Apostolical Church."—*From the Sermon on Primitive Tradition*, p. 6.

95. "We are naturally, if not reasonably, jealous of the word Tradition, associated as it is in our minds with the undue claims and pernicious errors of Rome."—*Ibid.* p. 20.

96. "The genuine Canons of the Primitive Councils, and the

genuine fragments of the Primitive Liturgies, are reducible into a small space; even although we go so low down in both as the division of the Eastern and Western Churches, including the six first councils general, and excluding image-worship, and similar corruptions by authority."—*Ibid.* p. 40.

97. "The reverence of the Latin Church for tradition, being applied unscrupulously, and without the necessary check from Scripture, to opinions and practices of a date comparatively recent, has led a large portion of Christendom to disuse and contempt, not of Scripture only, but of that real and sure tradition, which they ought to have religiously depended upon."—*Ibid.* p. 45.

98. "Had this rule (the exclusion of novelty,) been faithfully kept, it would have preserved the Church just as effectually from Transubstantiation on the one hand, as from the denial of Christ's real Presence on the other hand. The two errors in the original are but Rationalism in different forms;—endeavours to explain away, and bring nearer to the human intellect, that which had been left thoroughly mysterious both by Scripture and Tradition."—*Ibid.* p. 47.

99. "Many men . . . have argued against an imaginary case, instead of addressing themselves to the realities of Church History; and have thus given an advantage to Romanists on one side, and Rationalists on the other, of which neither party has been slow to avail itself. Such is not the way of the English Church; she does not so violently sever the different parts of the constitution of the Kingdom of Heaven; but acknowledging Scripture as her written charter, and Tradition as the common law whereby both the validity and practical meaning of that charter is ascertained, venerates both as inseparable members of one great providential system: without confounding their provinces, or opposing them to each other, in the manner of modern Rome. Why should it be thought a thing incredible, that persons should be found among her members and ministers, desirous to follow, as God shall give them grace, in so plain, so reasonable, so moderate, so safe a way? Because they call attention to the fact, that "*Primitive Tradition is recognized in Holy Scripture,*" as being, AT THAT TIME, of paramount authority; why should they be presently suspected of having a system of their own in reserve,—a theory, like some parts of Romanism, *still* independent of Holy Scripture, and to be supported by *modern* traditions?"—*Ibid.* p. 74.

100. "Because the Romanists make bold with the word Tradition on very different matters from this—mere instructions of a part of the present Church, in no wise [able to stand the test of Vincentius, even supposing them uncontradicted in Scripture:—are we therefore to throw aside or depreciate a Tradition, established as we see the Nicene Creed is?"—*Ibid.* p. 147.

101. "Of course, if so it had pleased Almighty God, the Scriptures might have been all clear of themselves; or their meaning might have been clearly revealed to individuals, at a certain stage of their progress in the Christian life; or there might be somewhere in the present Church an unerring court of appeal to fix their interpretation.

Men may go on imagining the advantages of such a dispensation, until they have persuaded themselves that things are really so ordered. But theories of that kind, after all that can be said in their favour, must they not incur the censure of true wisdom, as partaking of "that idle and not very innocent employment of forming imaginary models of a new world, and schemes of governing it?" How much better, humbly to acquiesce in God's dispensations as we find them! How much more dutiful, with all seriousness to use our privilege of belonging to a Church, which, on the one hand, refers us to Scripture as the standard and treasure of all necessary doctrine, on the other hand, "ties her doctors, as much as the Council of Trent does, to expound Scripture according to the consent of the ancient Fathers!"—*Ibid.* p. 149.

¹ Bp. Taylor's Works, x. 322.

INDEX.

- Additions, Roman, 21. 62
 Anathemas, 10. 22. 83
 Angel worship, 36. 74
 Anglo-Catholics, contented, 24. 44^b. 54.
 101; not innovators in discipline, 56.
 57; highly-favoured in their Reformation,
 45; persecuted, 9. 45. 60; op-
 posed to Romanism, 5. 6. 55. 93;
 successful in opposition, 86; always
 accounted Papistical by those who
 went further, 44^b
 Catholic doctrine and practices not
 derived from Rome, 92
 Confession, forced, 14. 22
 Corruptions, Roman, 6. 12. 13. 15. 16.
 18. 20. 23. 26. 29. 31. 32. 38. 42. 43.
 51. 52. 73. 75. 76
 Corrupt state of Italian Churches, 90
 Council of Trent, 23. 67. 83. 87. 89
 Councils, General, 69
 Dark ages, 26. 72. 74
 Denial of Cup, 14. 22
 Fathers subsidiary to Scripture, 93
 Idolaters, Italian Romanists, 91
 Idolatry, 85
 Image worship, 14. 22
 Indulgences, 14
 Infallibility, 12. 61. 63. 68. 89. 101
 Intention in Sacraments, 22
 Invocation of Saints, 14. 22. 27. 37.
 49. 79
 Justification, 14. 81. 82
 Legends, 27
 Masses, usage of, 14. 25. 33
 Mediators, human, 39
 Merits, 14. 34. 80
 Penance, 25. 34. 44
 Perversions, Roman, 23. 25. 46. 76
 Popery, incurable, 7; a falling off, 73;
 pestilential, 7; malicious and cruel,
 15. 64; rebellious, 75; tyrannical,
 1. 67. 72; an insanity, 64; an evil
 spirit, *ibid.*; heretical, 3. 7. 8. 20;
 exclusive, 19; an apology for Lu-
 ther, 4; caused by Luther, 89; irre-
 concilably different from us, 7. 14.
 28. 50. 66. 84. 88; unscriptural, 6;
 presumptuous, 17; persecuting, 9.
 32. 53; political, 58. 59. 75; ration-
 alizes, 98; an Antichrist, 38. 40. 41.
 48. 72
 Prayer for the dead in Christ, 53
 Purgatory, 14. 22. 29. 31. 65. 77
 Rome, its strength, 8; a demoniac, 64;
 its claims exorbitant, 94
 Saint worship, 30. 36. 84
 Scripture, 70. 71
 Supremacy, Roman, 2. 12. 14
 Superstitious, Roman, 1. 72
 Traditions, 25. 51. 62. 70. 95. 96. 97.
 99. 100
 Transubstantiation, 10. 11. 14. 25. 31.
 33. 35. 49. 78. 84. 98
 Unknown tongue, Service in, 14

1840

1840. 9/8

Day of Judgement.

A SERMON,

PREACHED ON THE

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY,

IN S. PETER'S CHURCH, BRIGHTON.

BY THE

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW, CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH,
LATE FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE.

Published by request.

KNOWING THE TERRORS OF THE LORD, WE PERSUADE MEN.

2 Cor. v. 11.

SECOND EDITION.

OXFORD,

JOHN HENRY PARKER;

J. G. F. AND J. RIVINGTON, LONDON;

LODER, BRIGHTON.

1840.

The Sermon having been lengthened beyond what is now usual, in order to prevent, if it might be, misapprehension on so main a doctrine, sentences amounting in the whole to some pages were here and there omitted in the delivery; but the substance and doctrine of the Sermon is as when it was delivered.

PREFACE.

THE following Sermon is published, partly at the wish of some who heard it, partly to obviate some mis-statements (one made very publicly, and involving others and the Church) on the part of individuals, not members of the Church, who had not heard it. In these distracted days, it is well to go even beyond what the occasion seems to call for, if in any way it may contribute to the peace of the Church. It is hoped too, that the discovery of the strangeness of the mis-statements afloat, may, in each case, tend to undeceive some of the right-minded members of our Church, who suspect certain of her ancient doctrines, because represented to them as novelties, or as approximating in some way to the errors of the Church of Rome. The Sermon, whose character was thus mis-represented, was simply employed in impressing one fundamental doctrine of our Creeds*.

It is hoped also, that the consideration of the awful subject here dwelt upon, may tend, in some minds at least, to restore that feeling of responsibility, under which we should live and act, but the manifest absence of which, is one of the most distressing features of our day; of which the hard, rough, lawless way in which people allow themselves to speak of other men, and of divine things, is but one instance. It is not surprising that our responsibility is not *adequately* realized; this belongs to the matured Christian character. To live in the Divine Presence, do all things in reference to Him; nothing as even a better sort of heathen might do; bear about one always the consciousness that one is a member of Christ; endeavour in all things to approve one's self to Him; in a word, to "eat and drink" not like an ordinary person, but as the Apostle says, "to the glory of God"—to do this uniformly, consistently, unremittingly, would be an angel-life on earth; such as that of the first Christians was. On the other hand, it is nothing surprising that "the world" should know and feel nothing of all this. But what is lamentable is, that one sees in so many even well-minded persons, almost the very opposite of this; they seem to act, at most, as though they were under a sort of general law; they acknowledge, that they are to avoid certain classes of actions, (as those forbidden in the Ten Commandments,)

* Those who wish, on any good grounds, to know the character of the parochial teaching of the writers in question, may see it in the "Plain Sermons by contributors to the 'Tracts of the Times;'" but it were obviously hurtful to read any religious teaching out of curiosity.

that they are to perform certain others, such as acts of mercy and charity; they are aware that they are to act, in the main, on certain motives; but they seem to have no notion that they are responsible to God in all the details of their actions. They seem to act as to their time, incomes, expenses, dress, tables, speech, and so on, as if they were their own masters, not as having received all they are and have, and of all to give account before God. There is an evident absence of the endeavour to realize our responsibility to God. Religious people, for instance, often speak in a religious way about religion, and in a worldly way about worldly things: as if religion and the world had each their proper sphere; as though religion ought not rather to pervade and sanctify every thing: still more do so-called religious publications, whose authors yet mean to be religious. Would it be possible again that there should be such avowed difficulty in raising adequate funds for religious and charitable ends, in places so full of wealth and luxuries and comforts; would the sums collected be only a fraction of what is needed, and scarce to be called even a fraction of what is expended on superfluities, did people in any way realize that they were stewards of all they have, and must one day give account of their stewardship, and of having wasted their goods? Would people, looking to be saved, heap around themselves vanities, decorate their persons, or their tables, or their apartments, "live in purple and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day," while so many of the children of those who minister to their superfluities are untaught, thousands excluded from worshipping in the Church, because they prefer themselves and their own splendour to the honour of building the House of God,—could people do this, did they believe that for all this selfish refinement account will be to be given to Almighty God? Would people again thus gossip about religion, as about "some new thing," and substitute religious for worldly scandal, if they realized that for "every idle word" they must give account at the judgment-day?

It is for the Clergy especially to consider, how far this lax state of things may be owing to their having omitted to inculcate proportionably the Day of Account. The Apostles, from whom we derive our Creeds, placed it among the chief Articles of the Christian Faith. Modern schools have tried a different way; with what success our present condition may testify. Certainly, if men will be honest to themselves, the present state of things among us is not satisfactory, nor have the effects of a modern popular system, been what they would in their first

hopefulness have anticipated. The earnestness of many who embraced that system and its partial truth have had blessings; but it plainly has not produced the effects predicted of it. On the contrary, religious practice has, on a broad scale, oftentimes declined, as a sort of religious teaching has increased, and the inculcation of motives and privileges been substituted for that of detailed duties and Judgment to come. The full effects of this system can hardly be visible in our Church, in which our defective teaching, one way or the other, is ever corrected, in a degree, through her own silent teaching in her Creeds and her prayers. They are fearfully visible in large bodies of those who have left the Church, who have no such corrective, and who having begun in a misguided and unsubdued earnestness, have ended in losing even the moral probity, which was once in the main the characteristic of our countrymen. But there is, in truth, no compendious way of being religious; it is not by forming frames of mind and feelings once for all, or even by cultivating these, that people become or remain religious, but by religious actions, done in the fear and through the grace of God; Heaven must be won step by step, by the vigilant and careful walking of persons, who "stand in awe, and" [in that degree] "sin not," as knowing that "God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or bad."

It is hoped that the above remarks will not be offensive to any of the good men, who are yet entangled in a system of modern origin, and which, fully developed, (as with them happily it is not,) is essentially opposed to the teaching of our Church, and to the doctrine of Judgment to come, as taught in Holy Scripture and the Creeds of the Church Catholic. Still more it is hoped, that none will impute to the doctrine any consequences, which it might have according to their system; or speak of it as opposed to "justification by faith," because opposed to their view of it; or rashly reject it as though opposed to Scripture, because opposed to some men's private interpretations of Holy Scripture—lest they unwarily speak against the Truth of God; but let any weigh, apart from modern systems, or from the imperfections of the present statements, the sayings of Scripture—(and they were brought together, for the very purpose of repressing thoughtless and irreverent speeches against the truth;)—let them consider their plain meaning, not only what meaning might be put upon them separately, but what is their obvious meaning collectively; let them not put them aside (as the manner is) as difficult passages,

since they are in truth very plain ones; (the difficulty which has been found is not in them, but in reconciling them to systems at variance with them;)—and the teaching of the Church and of Scripture will be seen to be one. “He,” says S. Hilary^b, “is the best reader [of Holy Scripture] who rather looks for the meaning of the words *from* the words, than puts it *upon* them; who brings it *out of* them rather than *into* them; and does not violently make that to seem to be contained in the words, which before reading he may have assumed should be understood under them.” “Rather,” he says again^c, “let us bend our thoughts to its words, than, through the opinions of a deceivable understanding, subject its words to our thoughts.” And it were well, if all, on the one side and the other, would ever bear in mind whereof they are speaking; that idle speaking about Divine things may be of the worst sort of “idle words” of which account is to be given; and also that solemn warning against tampering with any thing delivered to us, “Who-soever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven^d.”

God grant that the consciousness of the account, one day to be given before our Judge, may quicken all our diligence and vigilance, that so, when that day comes, we may do it with joy and not with grief, and “following His blessed Saints” of old time, who had this truth ever before them, “in all virtuous and godly living, we may come to those unspeakable joys, which He has prepared for them that unfeignedly love Him, through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

Christ Church,

All Saints’ Day, 1839.

^b De Trin. i. §. 18.

^c In Ps. cxxxviii. §. 20.

^d Matt. v. 19.

P.S. Those who wish to think further on this awful subject would do well to read Bp. Taylor’s Advent Sermon, or Dean Jackson on the Creed, b. 11. c. xi. of which the close is here added, in the hope that earnest-minded persons at least, seeing how holy men thought thereon, may be led to meditate on the Day of Judgment rather than dispute upon it.

He shall then appear an inflexible Judge, but yet continues a merciful and loving High-Priest to make intercession for us. “Seeing then,” saith St. Paul, (and it is his conclusion of his former description of Him, as our Omnipotent All-seeing Judge,) “that we have a great High-Priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, (this is a title more mild and comfortable than the former of *λογος*, the Word of God,) let us hold fast our profession. For we have not

an high-priest, which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in the time of need." This time of need, is the day of judgment, or time of death.

But whereby shall we make just proof and trial, whether we hold our profession fast or no? By no other means than by the preserving the integrity and purity of our conscience: for we do not truly acknowledge or believe Him to be our High-Priest, unless we suffer Him, whilst it is called to-day, to cleanse and purify our consciences. "If our heart condemn us not," saith St. John, "then have we confidence towards God." To shut up all with that of the prophet Malachi, which is fully parallel to the former place of St. Paul, "He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and He shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness." So then they must be sons of Levi, (that is, men consecrated unto the service of the Lord,) and, even in this life, as gold and silver, (though mingled with dross,) which hope to escape that last and fiery trial. And such as hope to be made kings and priests unto our God for ever, must in this life be careful and diligent to practise upon themselves: daily presenting unto Him, first, the sacrifices of God, a troubled and broken spirit, (breathing out prayers, and sending forth tears:) and then their bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable. And lastly, the sacrifice of praise, that is, the calves or fruit of the lips; withal, not forgetting to do good, and to communicate, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.

The use of all that is said in this whole third section, concerning Christ's coming to judgment, is most flagrantly set down in powerful and moving expressions by St. Peter. And the short of his three inferences is this; "Beloved, I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance,—knowing that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts; and saying, Where is the promise of his coming?—But the Lord is not slack concerning His promise,—but is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. And the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night.—Seeing then that all these things must be,—what manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and godliness; looking for, and hasting to the coming of the day of God!—Seeing that ye look for these things, be diligent that ye may be found of Him in peace, without spot and blemish; and account that the long-suffering of the Lord is salvation.—Ye therefore, seeing ye know all these things before, beware, lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own stedfastness: but grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; to Him be glory both now and for ever. Amen.

S. Ambrose's Creed.

Lord Jesus, we believe that Thou shalt come to be our Judge. We therefore pray Thee help Thy servants whom Thou hast redeemed with Thy most precious blood. Make them to be numbered with Thy saints in glory everlasting."

How to meditate on the Day of Judgment, we may learn from the holy Bp. Andrewes, in whose private devotions occurs this, which has been thought to have been his midnight meditation.

Unbegotten Father, Only-begotten Son, Life-giving Spirit, compassionate, merciful, long-suffering, abundant in mercy, exceeding abundant in compassion, Thou Who lovest the just, and hast compassion upon sinners, Who passest over sins, and grantest prayers, God of the penitent, Saviour of sinners, I have sinned against Thee, O Lord, and thus and thus have I done.

Alas! alas! Woe! woe! How have I been enticed by my own lusts! how have I hated reproof! And neither stood in awe, nor shrunk back at The incomprehensible Glory, The awfulness of His Presence, The fearfulness of His Power, The strictness of His Righteousness, The lovingness of His Goodness! I would call, if any will hear me. To which of the holy Angels shall I look? Wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? How fearful is Thy Judgment, O Lord! When the thrones are set, the Angels stand by, men are brought in, the books are opened, deeds sifted, the thoughts, the secret things of darkness, brought to light! What judgment will be passed upon me? Who shall extinguish my flame? unless Thou pitiest me. Lord, as Thou art merciful to man, grant me tears, grant me great streams of tears, grant them me *to-day*.

For *then* will the Judge be without appeal, the Judgment-seat terrible, excuse unavailing, proofs unanswerable, punishment inexorable, hell unending, the Angels unpitied, the pit opening its mouth, the stream of fire sweeping away, fire unquenchable, the prison-house dark, the darkness without light, the beds of hot-coal, the worm unsleeping, the chains indissoluble, the abyss interminable, the wall impassable, the wailing uncompassionated. None to stand by, to plead, to deliver!

But I repent, O Lord, I repent; help Thou my unrepentance; and, more and yet more, prick, rend, break my heart. Behold! Lord, that I myself have indignation against myself, for the senselessness, unprofitableness, injuriousness, dangerousness, of my desire; that I abhor myself for its madness, vileness, deformity, worthlessness, shame, reproach; that my confusion is before me all day long, and the shame of my face hath covered me. Alas! Woe! Woe! Woe is me! How long? Behold, Lord, that I myself adjudge myself worthy of eternal punishment, yea, and of all the troubles of this world. Behold me, Lord, self-condemned: behold, Lord, and enter not into judgment with Thy servant. And now, Lord, I humble myself beneath Thy strong hand; I bow my knees to Thee, O Lord; I fall upon the earth, upon my face. Let this cup pass from me. I stretch out my hands unto Thee; I smite upon my breast, upon my thigh, (Jer. xxxvi. 19.) Out of the depths my soul crieth unto Thee, as a thirsty land unto Thee; and all my bones, and all that is within me! Lord, hear my voice.

Most of this he repeats in his "confession of sin," adding, I deserve death; yet I appeal from Thee, Lord, from Thee, Just, to

Thee, Lord, to Thee, Merciful; from the throne of justice to the throne of grace. Lord, receive this appeal; unless Thou receivest it, we perish. And, O Lord, carest Thou not that we perish? Who "wilt have all to be saved," Who willest not that any should perish! I am not worthy of the least of all Thy mercies. I am not worthy to be made one, even the meanest, of Thy hired servants. I am not worthy of the crumbs which fall from Thy table. I am not worthy to touch the hem of Thy garment.—For Thy great mercy, for the multitude of Thy compassions, for Thy Name, for the glory of Thy Name, be merciful to my sin, for it is great, for it is exceeding great. For the multitude, for the great multitude, the riches, the abundance, the superabundance, of Thy mercies; be merciful to me, Lord, a sinner. Lord, O Lord, be merciful to me, the chief of sinners. O Lord, let "mercy rejoice over" Thy "judgments" in my sin. O Lord, where my sin hath abounded, let Thy grace more abound. Lord, hear! Lord, be merciful! Lord, hearken and do; do and delay not, for Thine own sake!

Beside these, his daily Morning Prayer was,

Forgiveness and remission of all my sins, and all my offences,

Grant me, O Lord.

A Christian close of my life, without sin, without shame, and (if it seem good to Thee) without pain, and a good answer before the awful and terrible judgment-seat of Jesus Christ our Lord, Grant me, O Lord.

His Evening Prayer,

As the close of the day, so is the close of life, at hand. We then, mindful of it, pray Thee that Thou, Lord, O Lord, wilt order the close of our life, Christian and well-pleasing, without sin, and without shame, and (if it seem good to Thee) without pain, gathering us beneath the feet of Thy elect, when Thou wilt, and as Thou wilt, only without shame and sin—Judgment is nigh; a good and acceptable answer before the awful and terrible judgment-seat of Jesus Christ, Grant us, O Lord.

The same words recur in part in his special prayer for Wednesday, and on that of the Saturday.

Save me, Lord, and destroy me not. On the bed of sickness, in the hour of death, in the Day of Judgment, in that awful and terrible Day, deliver, Lord, and save me. Save me from seeing the face of the Judge in displeasure, from being placed on the left hand, from hearing the terrible sentence, "Depart from me," from being bound in chains of darkness, from being cast into outer darkness, from being tormented in the lake of fire and brimstone, where the smoke of the torments goeth up for ever and ever. Be merciful, be merciful, spare us, have pity on us, O Lord, and destroy us not for ever; save and deliver us; be it not so, O Lord.

And further,

There is a glory which shall be revealed; for when the Judge cometh, some shall behold His face with joy, shall be set on the right

hand, shall hear those most sweet words, "Come, ye blessed," shall be caught in the clouds to meet the Lord, shall enter into His joy, shall be blessed with the vision of Him, shall ever be with Him. They only, only they are blessed among the sons of men. O give to me, of all the last, the last place there, under their feet, under the feet of Thine elect, the last among them. And that this may be, may I find grace in Thy sight, that I may have grace to serve Thee acceptably with reverence and godly fear, &c.

In the same form, he thanks God, (amid a confession of sin,) that He had ever left in him "the memory of the last things," i. e. Death, Judgment, Heaven, Hell: and in his preparation for the Communion he prays that it may be "for the lightening of the weight of my many sins—an acceptable defence in the Judgment."

These passages give a very inadequate impression to one unacquainted with the deep confessions of sin wherewith they are encompassed; these devotions were his companion to the end, "worn in pieces," Bp. Horne tells us, "with his fingers, and wetted with his tears." If any would not readily use the like, let him think whether that holy man were too penitent, or himself too little.

How Bp. Ken continually thought of the Judgment-day, and prayed and lived with reference to it, is attested by his evening hymn, his daily devotion:

Teach me to live, that I may dread
The grave as little as my bed;
Teach me to die, that so I may
Rise glorious at The Aweful Day.

In Bp. Wilson's Saturday meditations are the following:

Heb. ix. 27. "It is appointed unto men once to die; but after this the Judgment."

May the thoughts of death, and of what must follow, by the grace of God, mortify in me all carnal security, and fondness for this world, and all that is in it, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life. And O that I may make my calling and election sure, that I may die in peace, and rest in the mansions of glory, in hopes of a blessed resurrection, and a favourable judgment at the Great Day.

And may the consideration of a judgment to come oblige me to examine, to try, and to judge myself, that I may prevent a severe judgment of God by a true repentance, and lead a life answerable to amendment of life, and that I may find mercy at the Great Day.

So well did these holy men realize the maxim of the Ancient Church;

"DAY AND NIGHT LOOK TO THE LAST DAY." "In every kind of our life, the memory of the Divine Judgment is to be engrafted and retained by us, so that when we do any thing, the memory of the Judgment sinking down in us, or rather never departing from us, all our works may be to the service of God. Blessed will he be, who shall have done nothing, unmindful of the Divine Judgment." Hil. in Ps. 118.

A S E R M O N .

THE DAY OF JUDGMENT.

JOEL ii. 11.

The day of the Lord is great and very terrible, who can abide it*?

God every where shews Himself to fallen man under a twofold aspect, as an Object of awe and fear, as of hope and love. Mercy was announced to man on his fall ; but it repealed not the sentence, " Thou shalt surely die : " life and death were set before him in the law : when God made His glory to pass by, He " proclaimed Himself as long-suffering, abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin ; " yet also as He Who would " by no means clear the guilty ; " as " gracious," but also " righteous." And as He unfolds the fuller measures of His goodness in our redemption, He accompanies them with more awful notices of His wrath ; He disclosed not to us everlasting joys, without warning us of everlasting fire. And thenceforth His servants have a twofold message to deliver,—of terror, and of peace ; of an offended God, and a reconciled Father ; of a merciful Saviour, and a just Judge ; of life and death ; of heaven and hell ; of everlasting joy, and of the never-dying worm, the never-extinguished fire. And of these, terror, for the most part, comes first ; we are living in the ruins of a lost world ; they who escape, escape, like Lot, out of the midst of the overthrow, out of the flames of God's wrath, wherein " the earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up ; " the Church into which we have been for the time brought, is but an

* First Lesson for the Morning Service.

Ark, wherein we have taken refuge from the destroying flood of fire; it was through the awe, which God has impressed upon our parents or His people, that we were by Baptism brought in thither, fear that "except we were born again of water and of the Spirit, we could not enter into the kingdom of God:" and of those who have been so brought in, and are now walking in the narrow path, which leadeth unto life, all, most probably, would have wandered from it, but that they were hedged round by the lightnings and thunders and the blackness of God's wrath which threatened them, and so durst not leave it; most, it is to be feared, once left it, more or less, and those who are now in it, have struck back again, some sooner, some later, scared into obedience by the fear of hell. Yea, and after men have walked for some time in it, still with their hopes of heaven there mingle from time to time the fears of hell, and God allures them onward by His promises, and drives and scourges them on by His threatenings, by hopes drawing them to Himself, to our promised Canaan, and by fears detaching us from the world, and deterring us from taking any portion of the accursed thing, which may encumber our march, and pull us back unto perdition. And so still well-nigh to the end, all have need to be quickened in their way, and made more careful by the Apostle's fear, "lest they should be cast-aways."

I would not, in this, seem to lay down any rule of God's dealings; there are they (and they are the most eminent saints of God) who, like Samuel, have ever been brought up in the temple of their God, and obeyed His first call, and all His calls from the first, saying unto Him, "Speak, for Thy servant heareth;" and these have less felt how the fear of God wrought in them, because they have always felt it: but, of most, one must say, that not only their parents' fear, which first brought them into the Church of God, but their own fears led to the love of God; that they sought refuge with God in Christ from their own fear of Him; that since out of Him they must be consumed, they fled to Him even though they should be consumed; that whoso has not,—I say not, stood in awe of God, (for all who have any thought of God, must feel awe before Him,) but feared Him, and for the most part, feared Him exceedingly, does not even now love Him.

Our Church has blended these together very solemnly; she teaches us, as many as can, three times in the week, one with another, to pray our God and Saviour "not to take vengeance of our sins," "not to be angry with us for ever," to "deliver us from His wrath and from everlasting damnation," to "deliver us in the hour of death and in the day of judgment:" she brings before us "all our sins, negligences, and ignorances," of all our past life, and teaches us to pray God continually, to forgive them: and this frame of mind she would have formed in the hearts of her most faithful children; she would have those, who wait continually upon God through their whole lives, still day by day pray Him, Who, "we believe, shall come to be our Judge," to "help us whom He has redeemed by His most precious Blood." And they who formed these prayers for us, were holy men of very old times; they felt "the day of the Lord" to be "great and very terrible;" they so prayed to be delivered in the day of judgment; and if they thought that they (holy as they indeed were) should scarcely escape, do we need less earnest cries for mercy of our Judge?

Wherever one opens Holy Scripture, it is full of awful warnings; on one Lord's day after another our Church repeats them in our ears; not one passes without its lesson of awe as well as of the comfort, which we so gladly appropriate. This day she has rehearsed to us the history^b of him, who, though in the marriage-feast or in the Church, yet not having on the wedding-garment, was "bound hand and foot, and cast into outer darkness, where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth;" and she subjoined the saying of our Lord, whose meaning seems so terrible, that we scarcely dare think of it, except the more to ask mercy of Him,—"Many are called, but few are chosen." And these things she repeats as a reason, why we should "see^c that we walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, redeeming the time." Again, she has told us from our Lord's own lips, of the final damnation of the unbelieving^d. This evening's first lesson speaks of God's "making" His own chosen people "sick with smiting them, and desolate because of their sins^e;" this morning's

^b Gospel for the day. ^c Epistle. ^d Mark xvi. 2d Morning Lesson.
^e Mic. vi.

of the "sun's^f being turned into darkness, and the moon into blood," of "wonders in heaven and in earth, blood and fire and pillars of smoke," as heralds only and forerunners of "the great and terrible day of the Lord." This evening we heard again that an Apostle's coming would be a subject of dismay, that he would "be found such as they would not^g." If such be the forerunners of that day, what will be the day itself? if such the presence of the servant, while there was yet time for repentance, what that of THE LORD, when there is no repentance? And so the Psalms, which also spake very terribly^h of the destruction of the wicked, of their being "wiped out of the book of the living," of their "perishing at the" very sight and "Presence of God," taught us very comfortingly, but also with wholesome awe, to pray, "Let not the pit shut her mouth upon meⁱ."

I would not set this forth as the exclusive teaching of this day; you will recollect that it is not; I would only bring before you collected the awful warnings of one day, to shew that if we turn our eyes from them, we act against God's ways both in Holy Scripture and in the Church.

But especially the "day of the Lord" is spoken of, as an object of awe and terror. It does not mean always directly the "day of judgment;" it is used of any time when God appears more visibly present in judgment, than in the ordinary dealings of His Providence; it is used of God's several visitations of His former people^k, or of His heathen enemies^l; it *may* mean also some yet to come^m, which shall sift and purge His present people, the Christian Church; but in either case it is but an image of The Day, which shall come; it speaks of both at once; all God's present judgments are but likenesses, shadows, earnest of "The Judgment:" all are God's visitations of sin; all declare His displeasure at it; they are punishments as well as chastisements; and to those who repent not, His present wrath is but a foretaste of "the wrath to come." And in the very chapter of Joel, both are remarkably combined; it begins with speaking of "a day of

^f Joel ii. 30, 31. ^g 2 Cor. xii. 20, 21. ^h Ps. lxxviii. 1, 2, 21, 23. Morn. Ps. lxxix. 23—29. Even. ⁱ Ps. lxxix. 16. ^k Is. ii. 12. Lam. ii. 22. Ezek. xiii. 5. Joel i. 15. ii. 1. Zeph. i. 7, 8, 14. ii. 3. ^l Is. xliii. 6, 9. xxxiv. 8. Jer. xlvi. 10. Ezek. xxx. 3. Joel iii. 14. ^m Zech. xiv. 1. Rev. vi. 17. xvi. 14.

darkness and gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness," a "great and very terrible day of the Lord," which was shortly to come upon Zion; and it proceeds to speak with the very same words, of "the great and terrible day of the Lord" which shall be at the end of all things. And this may have, among other, this meaning: when God's terrors in this world are approaching, well-nigh all fear; they fear for the most part even unduly, faithlessly; so God would teach them out of their own faithless fears, Whom and what and how they ought to fear; if they thus fear what may be only the destruction of the body, how much more that day, on which, unless they repent, "God will destroy both body and soul in hell!" For that day, when it comes, will be an object of fear to many who now fear it not, yea, to many who profess to look for it. "Woe unto you," says the Prophet Amos^p, "that desire the day of the Lord! To what end is it for you? the day of the Lord is darkness and not light."

To these warnings it is, of course, of much moment to us to take heed; they will not cease to be there, and to have their terrible meaning, although we turn away from them, nor does our looking at them make us more in danger of them: on the contrary, he alone is in danger of them, who drives the thought thereof from him; he alone is safe, who sets them before him. For they are truths, the words of Him Who cannot lie, Who points them out that we may escape them, Who will uphold us through them, if we lean on Him, and Who alone can uphold or save us.

The time, then, of which I would this day speak, is the most awful, which created being can meet, the day of judgment; more awful in its approach, more fearful to think of, than the day of death; we naturally shrink from the day of our death, from yielding up our spirits, from our bodies being dissolved; but this is in comparison nothing; it is indeed the end of our trial, and so is very awful; it makes all sure one way or the other; it fixes us; but men can approach it often without terror, even from very stupidity and dulness; as they have deceived themselves before, so they may now; they deceive themselves, and God often lets them be deceived; they know nothing of themselves, have never

ⁿ ver. 1, 2, 11.

^o v. 31, 32.

^p v. 18. add ver. 20. Mal. iii. 2.

Is. xxxiii. 14.

thought of themselves, or of the state of their souls, how should they at once know *all* they have to fear? they have deadened their conscience, it often cannot at once awake and speak. They are yet in the flesh; a vail is still drawn between them and their doom; they do not yet see God! But to what end is this? there remaineth yet another day, more fearful yet than the hour of death; the day of judgment. Then they cannot deceive themselves; the books will be opened, and their names must be in the book of life or not; they must be taken, or they must be left; their Judge must say to them, "Come, ye blessed of my Father," or He must say, "Depart, ye cursed;" must set them on His right hand or on His left; what use then will it be, my brethren, what we have persuaded ourselves in this life, what, to have counted that all will be well with us, to the very hour of death, when after death, there is yet the judgment? Rather how far better to have endured all the heaviness of doubt and fear and dread of hell up to the very moment of death, if God should in any case even till then send no full relief, and thereby to deepen our repentance and cries for mercy, than with the rich man to awake in hell in torments!

Who then are they, whose names are in the book of life? according to what shall we be judged? who shall be saved?

My brethren, I am speaking to Christians, and I need not say that through Christ alone can any be saved, that they only who are found in Him, are members of Him, shall be saved. Members of Him ye have all been made; saved ye have all been once; heirs of heaven ye have been chosen; ye have all been chosen out of the world to be made by Baptism "members of His Son, children of God, inheritors of heaven." Ye have all received glorious promises, gifts inconceivable; ye are not those things which ye were born; ye have been taken out of the state in which ye by nature were; ye have not only your own corrupt affections, tending to the flesh and to death, but ye have a principle of life, the earnest of the Spirit, the Giver of Life; ye have been made members of your Saviour Who hath Life in Himself, to give it to whom He will. What good ye have in you is not your own, but God's; what ye are, ye are by having been through Baptism born of God; what safety ye have, ye have by being *placed* in a state of salvation; nothing of your own ye have but misery and

an inheritance of wrath ; the power to resist evil and do good, ye have, not of yourselves, but of God. But are then all safe, who have been saved ? *shall* all be saved, who have been saved once ? Alas ! when eight persons only were saved in the ark, one, Ham, was a reprobate. " He that endureth to the end shall be saved^a." " We are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence stedfast unto the end^b." " We are the house of Christ, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end^c." " Be thou faithful *unto death*," saith our Lord again, " and I will give thee a crown of life^d." " To him that overcometh, will I give to sit on My throne^e."

It is a blessed truth then, that the salvation of as many as shall be saved, is of God in Christ ; He only took us out of our state of wrath and damnation ; He gave us life ; He by His indwelling Spirit hath given us our power to will, and our strength to perform ; He for Christ's sake and through His intercession pardoneth our infirmities, forgiveth our iniquities ; and whosoever shall be saved, shall be saved through Him, and as a member of Him. But who then *remain* members of Him ? and by what shall we, who have thus been saved, be judged at the last day ? Holy Scripture, my brethren, from first to last, gives but one answer ; " by our works." " Thou renderest to every man, according to his works^f." " The works of a man God shall render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways^g." " Shall He not render to every man according to his works^h ?" " God shall bring *every work* into judgment, with every secret thing, whether good or badⁱ." " What is a man profited," asks our Blessed Redeemer, " if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul ? For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels, and then He shall reward every man *according to his works*^k." " I, the Lord, search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, according to the fruit of his doings^l." " Who will render to every man according to his deeds, to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life, but to them that are contentious and do not obey the

^a Matt. x. 22. ^b Heb. iii. 14. ^c Heb. iii. 6. ^d Rev. ii. 10.
^e Rev. iii. 21. ^f Ps. lxxii. 2. ^g Job xxxiv. 11. ^h Prov. xxiv. 12.
ⁱ Eccl. xii. 14. and xi. 9. ^k Matt. xvi. 26, 27. ^l Jer. xvii. 10.

truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil^m.
 “ Every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labourⁿ. ” “ We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in the body, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad^o. ” “ Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap; for he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption, but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting^p. ” “ Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily as to the Lord, and not unto men, knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance;—but he that doeth wrong, shall receive for the wrong which he hath done^q. ” “ As He Which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation;—and *if ye call on the Father*, Who without respect of persons *judgeth according to every man’s work*, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear^r;” · i. e. our very privilege, our very permission, to call God “ Father,” is an awful gift; if we pray to Him as our Father, knowing that though children, He will give to us “ according to our works,” favouring none, but just and equal to all, we should, the Apostle says, “ pass the time of our life here *in fear*” and awe. “ I saw the dead,” says the beloved Disciple^s, “ small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened, and another book was opened, which is the book of life, and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works.” “ I am He,” saith our Lord Himself, “ That searcheth the reins and hearts, and I will give unto every one of you according to your works^t. ”

Behold, brethren, with what awful voice all Scripture, from Job to the Revelations, gives the same solemn answer, “ Thou shalt be judged according to thy works:” and all the history of the Old and New Testament relates in deed what it says in

^m Rom. ii. 6–9.
^p Gal. vi. 7. Eph. vi. 8.
^r Rev. xx. 12, 13.

ⁿ 1 Cor. iii. 8.
^q Col. iii. 23–25.
^t Rev. ii. 13.

^o 2 Cor. v. 10, 11.
^s 1 Pet. i. 17.

words, how holily and how awefully and how severely, as men would think, men have been judged according to their works. Be not deceived then, as saith the Apostle; Satan would use every means to take away this truth out of our hearts; he would make us through the things of the flesh forget it; he would tell us now, as in Paradise, "ye shall not surely die;" he would seem to praise God, Whom he teaches men to blaspheme, and tell us "ye shall not die, for God is very merciful;" he would teach us that it is like a hireling to look for a reward, which yet our Blessed Saviour in His human nature, Scripture^a saith, looked for; he would take the appearance of an angel of light, and use the holiest doctrines, and teach us that if we profess a belief in Christ, we shall be accepted, and shall *not* be judged according to our works, although Scripture says we shall; he would make us think it a merit to renounce our works, and that if we renounce them, we shall not be judged by them.

There is nothing from which the heart of man so recoils as to have all his secret works brought into judgment; to have them all spread before him, before men and angels; to be judged according to them; not to judge himself, as he may in this life, but to be judged by One All-holy; to have his doom fixed according to them, to heaven or hell endlessly. Yea, well may men shrink from it; for who knows not of that in himself, which he would not wish to have brought out before the world, before sinful men, such as himself, which he would fain forget and have forgotten? He would gladly throw himself (as we all at the end must) on the mercy of God, but he would not in any way have account taken of his works. And therefore Scripture enforces and would drive this truth home into our very souls, that we may not escape it, and ruin ourselves: wherever we open Scripture, we find it; our own consciences, (if we would listen to them,) the world around us, the history of others or of ourselves and most of all our Judge Himself, tells us, "Thou shalt be judged, according to that thou hast done, whether it be good or bad."

But what works, and what are meant by works? Every thing, wherein we have a choice one way or other. Thoughts, words, as well as outward actions, are among these works. Our thoughts are works; "yea, in your hearts ye *work* iniquities,"

^a Heb. xii. 2.

says the Psalmist^a. And yet, how much of our life is passed in thoughts! how much, even while we are outwardly employed upon other things! what a hidden world of thought is there within every man's bosom, known only to himself and to God! how they crowd each other, throng one upon another, come unbidden, leave no outward trace, and yet defile! "Out of the heart," says our Blessed Saviour^x, "come evil thoughts—and these (as well as evil works) defile the man!" How quick they come, so that the mind half or wholly assents to them, and so sins, even if the man speedily recover! How quickly, for instance, (as each one's besetting sin may be,) will thoughts of anger, covetousness, vanity, lust, greediness, malice, hatred, suspicion, ill-will, or worldliness, come into a man's heart, and be lodged there, and inwardly acted upon, while he, from very habit, is scarcely aware of it! How often will one, even after he have broken off a sin, have a momentary pleasure in the recollection of its enjoyment, even though he shake it off again! how will he even imagine the pleasure of a sin from which he was saved! how will a thought of vanity express itself in the countenance or the gesture, though the speech give no utterance to it; how will it colour other actions; how will such thoughts do their work, and then vanish unperceived! how, even in this house of prayer, will strange thoughts steal away our prayers! "Who can say, I have made my heart clean?" and if saints have so spoken, what must be the case of common Christians! How, for instance, will worldly thoughts beset a man during his whole employment; and yet these are idolatry! how, on the news of another's well-doing, will envious thoughts be the first to enter a man's mind; and yet envy is the especial sin of the Evil one! and "where envying and strife is, there," says the Apostle^z, "is confusion and every evil work." So that a man may be full of evil, although he perceive it not, because he has been accustomed to think only of his outward actions, and these may be outwardly fair to men. A mere worldly person, who does not overreach, is not dishonest, will pass well among men, and yet "his eyes and his heart are not but for his covetousness:" and so on through the whole black

^a Psalm lviii. 2.

^x Matt. xv. 19, 20.

^z Prov. xx. 9.

^z Jam. iii. 17.

^a Jer. xxii. 17.

list of sins. "Woe to him," saith Scripture^t, "that coveteth an evil covetousness;" "the covetous man shall not inherit the kingdom of God^u." Any one who has by God's mercy been awakened to watch his besetting sin, will be scared to see how often thoughts connected with that sin are more or less received into his mind. And, O my God, if these things are to be given account of, how much besides, how many more thoughts,—which we do not check,—which we have indulged,—which we have sought after,—and which yet were sin! And yet He with Whom we have to do is "a Discerner of the *thoughts* and *intents* of the heart^v." It is one special part of the day of judgment "to judge the secrets of men^w," "to bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the *counsels of the hearts*^x." "I am He," He saith, "that searcheth the reins and hearts, and I will give unto every one of you according to your works."

Then also *words* are "works;" they are among the works for which a man shall be acquitted or condemned. "I say unto you," says our Blessed Lord, "that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment; for by thy words shalt thou be justified, and by thy words shalt thou be condemned^y." It needs not for a man's condemnation that he have sinned in deed, as men call deeds, "by his words he may be condemned." "Death and life are in the power of the tongue; and they that love it, shall eat the fruit thereof^z." Of many sins, of many damnable sins, the tongue is the natural and chief instrument; therewith men persuade others to sin, or lessen their dread of it, or cheer them on in it; yet "cursed is he that maketh the blind to go out of his way^a;"—therewith men blaspheme God and take His holy Name in vain, yet such, God saith,—the more awefully, because He expresseth not what the judgment will be,— "He will *not hold guiltless*;"—therewith men curse men, which are made after the likeness of God; yet whoso "loveth cursing," God saith^b, "it shall *happen unto him*;"—therewith men lie one to another, yet "liars," God saith^c, "shall have their portion in the lake of fire;"—therewith men slander, backbite,

^t Hab. ii. 9. ^u 1 Cor. vi. 10. Eph. v. 5. ^x Rom. iv. 12.
^v Rom. ii. 16. ^w 1 Cor. iv. 5. ^y Matt. xii. 36, 37. ^z Prov. xviii. 21.
^c Deut. xxvii. 18. ^a Ps. cix. 17. ^e Rev. xxi. 8.

speak evil one of another; but "if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another;"—therewith they cheat and defraud each other; yet "the Lord is the Avenger of all such, as Himself hath forewarned and testified^d;"—therewith how many of the works of the flesh are wrought, "uncleanness, lasciviousness, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, maliciousness, debate, deceit, malignity, whisperings, despitelness, pride, boastings, undutifulness to parents^e;" whereof God saith, "the judgment of God is, that they who commit such things are worthy of death^f;" that "they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God^g." Surely, as St. James^h saith, "what a fire, what a world of iniquity the tongue in itself is, defiling the whole body, and setting on fire the course of nature, and it is set on fire of hell!" and how should it, thus kindled by hell, escape the fire of hell hereafter? whence in the parable, the "tongue" of the rich man especially is "tormented in that flame." And yet not the very bad only thus sin with the tongue. "If any man offend not in word," says St. Jamesⁱ, "the same is a perfect man;" and since we are so far from perfect, what must our offences be! Yet all the sins of the tongue are sins of the heart also, for "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh;" yet are they not all its sins, for the heart has many sinful thoughts, which it is ashamed to utter, although it shall be compelled to utter them at the great day.

If such are the evil works of the tongue and of the thoughts, whereof men must give account, how many must those be of the whole body; all deeds of violence, of wrath, uncleanness, gluttony, drunkenness, revellings, thefts, sabbath-breakings, petty acts of dishonesty as men speak, spitefulness, unmercifulness, unforgiveness; and these again are sins of the heart also, they have been sinned oftentimes in heart, before they are sinned in act, and when sinned in act, there are the two-fold sins to account for, the sins of the heart and the sin of the act too; nor may we look upon the sins of the heart or our sinful thoughts, only as leading to the open sin; they are themselves sins; they were by themselves worthy God's wrath and damnation; they

^e Gal. v. 15.
^f Rom. i. 32.

^d 1 Thess. iv. 6.
^g Gal. v. 21.

^e Gal. v. 19, 20. Rom. i. 29, 30.
^h iii. 6.
ⁱ iii. 2.

make the open sin worse, because a thing thought of beforehand is worse when done, and is done against many more checks of God's Holy Spirit; and yet they remain as so many separate sins, which are also to be accounted for; so that when a man recollects one sin, which he has committed, there will be many more behind, which he does not recollect, which led to it, but which were themselves sin. Let a person trace the course of any one sin, he will have had much doubt probably before he first gave way to it; and even after he had begun to give way, he will have had much doubt before he fell into the act of sin; and even after his first fall, he will have had some struggle with himself before he *altogether* gave way; and even after it grew into a habit, he will have had visitings of compunction, and secret calls to abandon it; and each of these feelings of doubt, or misgiving, or remorse, or fear, was the work of God's Holy Spirit within him; and if he gave way, (i. e. gave way to Satan,) he will have to give account for having so many several times done despite to God's Holy Spirit, and grieved Him. And this is but one sin, and how many sorts of sins are joined together with each one sin. This is but one sin, and if one attempts to think of all, "the whole head becometh sick, and the whole heart faint." And in this one sin, which is fixed most upon his conscience, he may see the history of many others to which he is not so alive.

Such are some of the kind of actions, brethren, by which men are to be judged; and what or how many of them are to be brought into judgment? *All*, none excepted; all of every sort; for when Holy Scripture excepteth none, none are to be excepted; and Scripture saith, men "shall be judged according to their works;" "God shall bring *every* work to judgment;" "the dead were judged out of those things that were written in the books according to their works." All man's works, then, which he hath ever done, will be brought forward; every thought, word, and action; not, for example, that any one has been a drunkard, or unclean, but each separate action and thought, all will be brought before him; perhaps all will be brought before him at one moment of time; and as an earnest thereof, even in this life, God sometimes brings before men, in one moment of agony, a large portion of life, brings up things long forgotten, and he sees in a moment a world of ill done by

himself, he sees himself in all the ill which he has done. With God there is no past or future; all is present to Him, and He may make all our sins at once present to us, as they are to Him. But, in any case, every evil work, which every man hath done, will be shewed openly before God, and the Holy Angels, and the whole world; every one, things hidden, and things known; things which none saw, save the sinner, as well as things seen of men; the sins of boyhood and youth, as well as the sins of manhood and age; sins, which passed from our thoughts as soon as sinned, or which we scarcely thought to be sins, as well as those we remember: sins repented of, and sins unrepented; every sin, from the disobedience of the child to murder or hatred of God; every murmur of discontent, every thought of vanity, "every idle word," every angry look, every unclean thought, every thing, which man has ever thought or said or done, or not done, not said, not thought, as he ought, all his neglect of or carelessness in prayer, all his unthankfulness to God, shall be brought into judgment. Think, my brethren, how much takes place in the hours of any one day; how many thoughts you have, how many words you speak, how many acts you do; and in all there may be sin: all may be done as God wills or as He wills not; think then what there would be in the hours of many days, many hundreds and thousands of days: that were a very short life which had not thousands of days; and yet each day of those several thousand days, since thou first knewest good and evil, throughout all its several hours, has its own account to give to God.

Again, who are they who are to be judged for *all* their actions? *All*: "we shall *all*," says the Apostle^k, "stand before the judgment-seat of Christ." Not those only whom the Judge shall pronounce "Cursed," and who shall depart into fire everlasting, but *all*; not only those who shall be condemned, but those who shall be saved; *all* alike shall come into the Judgment; *all* alike shall stand before their Judge; *all* shall give account of *all* things done in the body, whether they be good or bad. The highest saints shall be there; there shall St. Paul be, and give account of his "labours most abundant" for the sake of Him Who is his Saviour and his

^k Romans xiv. 10.

Judge, and of his sharp contention with Barnabas : there St. Peter of his faithful feeding of his Redeemer's sheep, and of that which he did, which "was to be blamed," at Antioch ; there shall all the Martyrs, Confessors, and Saints of old time be, shaming us that we have not come up to them ; there shall we all, one by one, be, giving account of all the talents we have each received, all the help which we have each had from God, all the good things, which by His strength we have done, which He has wrought in us, and wherein we have (amazing words !) wrought together with God¹ ; all wherein, loving our Blessed Redeemer, we have kept His commandments ; but also all wherein we have grieved God's Holy Spirit, and neglected His warnings, and put aside His help, and done against His commands—we shall have to give account of all ; *all*, from the hour of our baptism to our death, will be tried by the Will of God, which is the righteous and unerring measure and source of all right things ; and as they are wrought in God, or no, according to His will, or no, so will they by Him, Who is "no respecter of persons," be rewarded or punished, and more or less rewarded, everlastingly.

But some will be ready to ask, how doth the precious Blood of Christ advantage us, if we are thus to be judged according to our deeds ? if those who believe in Christ, and flee unto Him for refuge, and trust and rely in Him with all their hearts, are still to be judged by their works, what have they more than others ? we have renounced our own righteousness, our own works, they will say, we have cast them away like "filthy rags ;" if we must be judged by them, how are we better off than others ?

This way of speaking is in part true, in part not true. As far as it means, that the precious Death of Christ is the only meritorious cause of our salvation ; that man's best works were nothing in themselves, nay, that in themselves they would be sinful ; that whosoever sins shall be forgiven, shall be forgiven only for the sake of that One Sacrifice for sin ; this is, of course, most true : but if it means that we shall be judged by any thing else but our own works ;—our works of sin which we have wrought ourselves, or our works of righteousness, which God hath wrought in us ;—then it is as plainly false ; for it goes directly against our Lord's

¹ 2 Cor. vi. 1.

own words, "He shall reward every man according to his works."

False then is every system of "will-worship and would-be humility," which, under the shew of not trusting in works, would make a work of faith, and look to its faith as something of its own, and seek to be saved by what it thinks faith. "Without faith we cannot please God^m," or do works pleasing to Him; yet not by our faith shall we be judged, but by our works. He has assigned us no other witness of our love for Him, than this, "Keep My commandmentsⁿ." He has told thee that thou shalt be judged, not according to what thou persuadest thyself that thou feelest,—but by what thou dost,—by thy works. The precious Blood of Christ is the sole hope of thy salvation, but not without thyself; in Baptism It is applied without works; then wert thou taken out of thy state of nature, that thou mightest, through His indwelling Spirit, "work out thy salvation," that thou mightest "do such good works, as He had prepared for thee to walk in." What, as wild branches, we would not have done, that, having been grafted into the true Vine, we received power to do,—bear fruit,—not of ourselves, but through that blessed stream which runneth through every branch of the Vine, which will receive it, and which cometh from Him, members of Whom we were made. Whatever any one hath, he hath received, and may not boast^o; yet men may receive power to "work righteousness," and so "obtain the promises^p."

We must not then think of our works as something separate from Christ; they are Christ's works in us, and, as far as they are wrought in Him, to be thought of thankfully, and acknowledged humbly. They are a store and an earnest (however little we know of their real value) of an eternal reward, and, as well as that reward, to be acknowledged as His gift.

Since also we are thus closely united with Christ, these works so wrought have an inexpressible value, which of themselves they could not have; they are not to be looked on as our works as men, but as belonging to those who have been taken out of our lineage in Adam, and made members of Christ; they belong to

^m Heb. xi. 6. ⁿ John xiv. 15. "If ye love Me, keep My commandments."
^o 1 Cor. iv. 7. ^p Heb. xi. 33.

us, as we belong to the Only-Begotten Son of God, and for His sake, the Father looks upon them, as upon us, with infinite love, a love which they deserve not in themselves, but wherewith He beholds them and us, as being wrought in and through His Only-Begotten, Whom He loveth infinitely.

These were the comforts of saints and their glories; but for us, whose measure for the most part is so poor, there is yet another consolation, which was also a far higher comfort to them, who knew it so much more,—that not simply are our works, such as we now have, wrought in Christ, but that we, having been made members of Christ, are, by His all-prevailing Intercession, retained such; by that Intercession, whereby He, the Sacrifice and High-Priest, pleadeth His own Sacrifice for our sins, whereby He appeareth as our Advocate with the Father, and presenteth also our broken prayers, and interrupted longings, our dried-up fountains of tears, our half-penitent penitence, our defective victories, our scarred strifes with sin, cleansed and purified by His precious Blood. By that Intercession, by His Holy Spirit, Which He hath given us, Which still dwelleth in us (unless we be reprobates⁹) and uniteth us to Him, doth He give us power to offer even these services, and maketh them available; He maketh us partakers of the prayers of the Church and of our friends, of His absolution, through His Ministers; of the Holy Communion of His Blessed Body and Blood, our ransom: and what raised them, who used these means rightly, to high thrones in heaven, may, we do trust, save us from falling into the gulf of perdition. For in Him we have, though a just, yet still a merciful, Judge, Who hath compassion upon our weakness, and is “touched with the feeling for those infirmities,” which He bare for us on the Cross. Thrice-blessed were they, who kept their white robes, wherewith in Baptism He clothed them, and bare them, through His grace, undefiled before His tribunal, to life eternal¹; yet blessed they also, who, having defiled them, have washed them with their tears, and through their tears had them cleansed anew in His Blood. Blessed they, who overcame and “kept His works unto the end²,” yet blessed they also, who having been overcome, have “remembered³ whence they were fallen, and repented, and

⁹ 2 Cor. xiii. 5.
¹ ib. v. 5.

² Old English Baptismal Service.

³ Rev. ii. 26.

done the first works." Earnest repentance, and what belongs to repentance, is a great work, which He giveth, and which He will accept.

This doctrine, thus briefly set before you, was a chief means by which holy men of old attained their excellence. They believed in heart, as well as in lips, that God was "a Rewarder of such as diligently seek Him," and so "they sought Him early" and earnestly and through their whole lives. They "looked to the recompense of reward;" they with their Master and only Saviour, "for the joy which was set before them, despised the shame and endured the cross," yea, "took up" cheerfully their Saviour's "cross, and followed Him." They considered ever their latter end, and so keeping their eyes stedfastly toward heaven, all which they met with in this world seemed short and trifling, and of no account: its pleasures, its follies, its sins, had no hold upon *their* hearts; they saw them not, felt them not; their souls and their thoughts and their desires were stedfastly fixed in heaven, where their Saviour is, and so they scarce saw those things, which we, who look so unsteadily around us, with so little fixedness of purpose, are so continually embarrassed with. And this doctrine they placed for us in all our Creeds, that we might fix it in our hearts: they set it before us whenever we should come into these houses of prayer; "He shall come from the right hand of the Father to judge the quick and dead;" they would have us repeat it, whenever we profess that belief, on which our salvation hangs; they would have us daily repeat it, so we should have it throughout the day fixed in our thoughts. *They* ever daily thought on the "four last things," death, judgment, heaven, and hell, and so were ever armed against the wiles of Satan.

In these days even earnest-minded persons often regard this truth less than they ought; they think that they shall have to give account of their stewardship *upon the whole*, whether they have believed in Christ or no, but they do not accustom themselves to think that they shall be judged, not simply by what they on the whole became, but by all the several actions of their lives; and on this account, in part, among others, have we not reached the measure of the deeds of our fathers.

The doctrine is full of comfort, and full of awe. It gives to all our separate actions a value beyond what we can think. All

are there, all are written in God's book, all "the follies of our childhood, and the headiness of our youth, the wildness of our head, and the wanderings of our heart" after these perishable things, all the sins of our tongue, all the evils we have done or caused, as well as the little good which most of us have done, and so also all which we shall do, day by day, the least as the greatest,—all is there written. He who "numbereth the hairs of" all "our heads," for Him it is a light thing to note all the actions of our lives; what we, who are here this day, have done since we have been in this house; how we have prayed, listened, repented, praised Him; what we shall do when we leave it; how we employ the rest of this, the Lord's day, how we act in our homes, at our meals, this day and through the week, in the pettiest things of this life; how we govern our tempers, our appetites; the pettiest and most common acts of dishonesty in trade, even those which are so common that men scarce account of them; the ready lie, to excuse self, or to gain, or to please; the proud look; the wanton or the vain thought; the back-biting speech; joy at our neighbour's ill, or envy at his good and of God's grace in him; how we deny ourselves as well as how we are kind to others; all will be there, and by all shall we be judged.

Be this then ever before us; be our first thought, morning by morning, to think of the morning of the resurrection; be our last, night by night, the sleep of death, after which cometh the judgment; be this our safeguard through the day, "soul, take heed what thou doest, for for all these things thou wilt be judged:" remember the parching flame, the never-dying worm, the everlasting fire, the gnashing of teeth, "the smoke of the torment" which "goeth up for ever and ever," where "they have no rest day nor night."^u Set heaven and hell ever before your eyes, so may you escape hell, and by God's mercy attain heaven; remember the awful sight when He, Who came to be our Saviour, shall come again to be our Judge; when the sight of the Lamb Who was slain to take away our sins, will be so terrible, that men shall "say to the mountains and rocks, 'fall on us, and hide us from the face of Him That sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of

^u See Bishop Taylor's "Golden Grove;" Litanies. For pardon of sins.

^x Rev. xiv. 11.

the Lamb^y." "We shall surely die, because we have seen God^z," they said of old; what will it be to see God, and wish to die, and not be able to die? to see Him, not in mercy, as He ever shewed Himself to men, but in wrath? to find that in all whom you have sinned against, you have sinned against Him; that in all you have despised, you have despised Him; that the evil which you have done to the least of His brethren, you have done to Him; that He, the sinner's only hope, and Who so long suspended the Father's sentence from you, is come to do vengeance on all the ungodly, who would "not obey the truth;" that they who obeyed not His sceptre, must be crushed by His rod?

It is very awful to repeat these words; awful to us, who know so little of it, awful to us, who know them only as words, and know them not, (God grant that we may never know them!) feel them not, see them not, as realities. What would they be when we see them? What to see the unveiled presence of God, Who "is a consuming fire," in His wrath? What to see Him, Who came to reveal the good tidings of the Gospel, as "the power of God unto salvation unto every one that believeth," when He shall come to reveal the full wrath of God upon them that believe not?

The end then is briefly this, "Fear God, and keep His Commandments, for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether good or whether bad." Be we all more watchful, what for the future shall be written in those books which shall be opened in that day, and from which our sentence shall be read. Be the young, of whom as yet little comparatively has there been written, especially heedful, what shall be there written; their pages are not yet filled up; let them keep themselves diligently through God's holy keeping, that not evil but good may be written of them there. And for us, the larger portion of whose account is already there, labour we the more, that what is already there against us, may be at the last blotted out; what yet remains, may be more according to His will. For all which

^y Rev. vi. 16.

^z Jud. xiv. 22. add vi. 22. Gen. xxxii. 30. Exod. xxiv. 11. xxxiii. 20. Deut. v. 22. Is. vi. 5.

yet remains, be diligent; for all the past, repent; for *all* you must be brought to judgment, for *all* repent. Watch over *all* your acts, thoughts, deeds, as having to give account for all; repent day by day of "*all* the sins, negligences, and ignorances" of *all* your past lives; bring them all before Him, at least when you repeat His Son's own words, "Forgive us our trespasses;" pray Him for His Son's sake to forgive them all, to blot out all; do "works meet for repentance;" acts of restitution; acts of humiliation; acts of penitence, acts especially of self-denying charity, whereby Scripture saith, "iniquity is purged away":* and though you must see your sins once again read out of that book at the judgment-day, they will not be your condemnation. Pray Him with the penitent thief, to remember thee when He cometh in His kingdom, and not to remember thy sins; and He Who despiseth not the sighing of a contrite heart, nor the desire of them that be penitent, He will cause His face to shine on thee: not a single sigh for past sins escapes His ears; not a groan of the heart but is heard by Him; not a tear falls to the ground, but He putteth it in His bottle; not a breathing of the soul after His holiness; not a loathing of our own unholiness; not an act of self-abasement, or humbling ourselves for sin; not a yearning of the soul for a purity which it hath not, if it be but followed by action; not an act of mercy, done in hopes that we may "obtain mercy;" not an act of self-denial in token of our displeasure and self-condemnation at our offences, but we shall find there; every fragment of our poor sorrow and service we shall find there, gathered and stored up, and nothing lost. We know not what they are, yet God doth, and giveth them a value which they have not, for His Son's sake; and He who gave us our godly sorrow, will then acknowledge it; He who gave thee thy humility, will then exalt thee; He who taught thee mercy, will be merciful unto thee; He who gave thee the mind to give to His poor members, whether it be the cup of cold water, or the two mites, if they be all thou hast, or to give abundantly out of abundance, He will own them as done unto Himself. He will once more blot out, and for ever, the handwriting against us, that our sins and iniquities be remembered no more; and our Judge Whom we have besought to help us, and in Whose name we sought for-

* Prov. xvi. 6.

givenness, will acknowledge us, and say to us not merely "Go in peace, thy sins be forgiven thee," but "Thy sins be forgiven thee, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord;" and "so shall we ever be with the Lord," in the blessedness of heaven, which is above all thought, praising Him Who hath redeemed us, and hath cleansed us from our sins, and given us repentance, and saved us from Satan, and from ourselves, and from everlasting punishment.

Only be zealous and repent, and "bring forth fruits meet for repentance," and pray God daily to forgive you, for His Ever-Blessed Son's sake.

O God, the Protector of all that trust in Thee, without Whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy; increase and multiply upon us Thy mercy; that Thou being our Ruler and Guide, we may so pass through things temporal, that we finally lose not the things eternal: grant this, O heavenly Father, for Jesus Christ's sake our Lord. Amen.

THE END.





3 2044 011 652 898

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED
AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS
NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON
OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED
BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE
NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE
BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.



